

FEB 26 1944

Volume LIX

FEBRUARY, 1944

Number 2

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
DAVIS, EDWIN B.—Latin '-ct-' > Old French 'it'	75
SPITZER, LEO.—The Farical Elements in 'Inferno,' Cantos XXI-XXIII,	83
SINGLETON, C. S. AND SPITZER, LEO.—'Decameron' VIII, 9: 'carapignare,'	88
FRANK, GRACE.—'Biaus Niés'	92
MAUTNER, F. H.—'Nazi' und 'Sozi'	93
SPITZER, LEO.—Wienerisch 'Remassuri,'	100
NAUMANN, WALTER.—Christinae Heimreise' und ihr Vorbild,	104
MENNER, ROBERT J.—Two Old English Words,	106
MEZGER, FRITZ.—On <i>Fader Feorme</i> , 'Beowulf,' Line 21,	113
STEIN, ARNOLD.—Stanza Continuity in 'The Faerie Queene,'	114
HAIGHT, G. S.—The Author of "The Address," in Quarles's 'Shepheards Oracles'	118
BABB, LAWRENCE—Hamlet, Melancholy, and the Devil,	120
MAXWELL, BALDWIN.—The Source of the Principal Plot of 'The Fair Maid of the Inn,'	122
HARBAGE, ALFRED.—Materials for the Study of English Renaissance Drama,	128

REVIEWS:—

T. M. PARROTT and R. H. BALL, <i>A Short View of Elizabethan Drama</i> ; M. M. BHATTACHEEY, "Courtesy" in Shakespeare; O. J. CAMPBELL, <i>Shakespeare's Satire</i> ; T. W. BALDWIN, <i>William Shakespeare's Petty School</i> . [<i>Hardie Craik</i> .]	133
P. B. Gove, <i>The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction</i> ; W. R. IRWIN, <i>The Making of "Jonathan Wild"</i> ; G. H. MAYNADIER, <i>The First American Novelists</i> ; F. M. A. HILBISH, <i>Charlotte Smith, Poet and Novelist (1749-1806)</i> . [<i>Ernest Bernbaum</i> .]	137
W. W. GREG, <i>The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare</i> . [<i>M. A. Shafer</i> .]	139
R. E. BENNETT (ed.), <i>The Complete Poems of John Donne</i> . [<i>R. B. Botting</i> .]	141
D. M. WOLFE, <i>Milton in the Puritan Revolution</i> . [<i>Walloes Notebooks</i> .]	142
T. C. IZARD, <i>George Whetstone: Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters</i> . [<i>J. A. Gee</i> .]	143
F. H. LYELL, <i>A Study of the Novels of John Galt</i> . [<i>B. A. Booth</i> .]	145
H. W. STARR, <i>Gray as a Literary Critic</i> . [<i>W. P. Jones</i> .]	146
H. M. SMYSER and F. P. MAGOUN, JR. (trs.), <i>Survivals in Old Norwegian of Medieval English, French and German Literature</i> . [<i>F. Mezger</i> .]	147
BRIEF MENTION: L. C. JONES, <i>The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes</i> ,	148

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

DON CAMERON ALLEN

HAZELTON SPENCER
C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON

Advisory Editors

E. Faize, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$6.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNE*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MP*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RR*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the *editors* with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

BOOKS WANTED

IN FRENCH, GERMAN, ITALIAN, SPANISH, LATIN, GREEK
and other languages. (No school texts wanted.)

Small lots or large libraries purchased for cash.

SCHOENHOF BOOK COMPANY

(Established 1836)

HARVARD SQUARE, CAMBRIDGE 38, MASS.

FIFTY YEARS OF MOLIÈRE STUDIES. A Bibliography, 1892-1941. By PAUL
SAINTONGE and ROBERT WILSON CHRIST. Extra Volume XIX. 313 pages.
\$3.50.

The most extensive bibliography of Molière is that of Desfeuilles, published as part of the Grands Ecrivains edition of the dramatist. It appeared in 1893, but included few items from 1892. MM. Saintonge and Christ have consequently begun their work with publications of 1892. They have brought it down to the end of 1941. Their volume constitutes an invaluable guide to students of Molière and of the theater in general, especially at a time like the present, when many aids to scholarship have ceased to be accessible.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
A postage for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1108,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

ter

tors
the
cript
cles
the
of
quo-
not
IP,
tors
ness



Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

FEBRUARY, 1944

Number 2

LATIN *-ct-* > OLD FRENCH *it*

Examples of this change appear in LLat 'faktu *factum*, 'nōkte *noctem*, fruktu *fructum*, which become OFr *fait* (Fr. *fait*), *nyit* (Fr. *nuit*), *fryit* (Fr. *fruit*). There are some points relating to the physiological patterns that still remain vague.

A table presenting the solutions offered by several linguists will make this clear. They are derived from the following sources, arranged in the chronological order of the latest references here quoted for each author: —

(1) K. Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, vol. 1, Copenhague, 1899. (2) G. Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*², vol. 1, Strassburg, 1904-6. (3) P. E. Guarnerio, *Fonologia romanza*, Milano, 1918. (4) W. Meyer-Lübke, *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache*^{2,3}, vol. 1, Heidelberg, 1913; 'Die Gruppe *ot*', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 1927. (5) E. Bourciez, *Eléments de linguistique romane*², Paris, 1930. (6) Schwan-Behrens, *Grammaire de l'ancien français*, part 1 (Bloch), Leipzig, 1932. (7) F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, vol. 1, Paris, 1933. (8) M. K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French*, Manchester, 1934. (9) A. Dauzat, *Histoire de la langue française*, Paris, 1930. (10) M. Grammont, *Traité de phonétique*, Paris, 1933; review of Dauzat's *Tableau, Le français moderne*, 1939.

The different stages, as premised by each of these, are here shown. The symbol *j* is used for fricative *j*. Roman characters here and elsewhere represent IPA transcription, based upon the opinion of competent scholars.

	kt	ct	kt	ct	xt	gt	ct	tt	t	jt	st	it
1. Nyrop			kt									it
2. Gröber			kt					tt	t			it
3. Guarnerio			kt			xt	ct					it
4. Meyer-Lüb.	kt			kt	ct							it
5. Bourciez	kt					xt				jt	it	

6. Sch-Beh.	kt		jt	it
7. Brunot	kt		jt	it
8. Pope	kt	xt	çt	jt it
9. Dauzat	kt	xt		jt it
10. Grammont	kt	ct	jt	jt it

The attempt to explain the graduation of this phonetic change is made by seven of these scholars, viz. Gröber, Guarnerio, Meyer-Lübke, Bourciez, Pope, Dauzat and Grammont. These analyses show certain differences. Without prejudice to the order in which they occurred, when we compare the Latin *ct* with its ultimate form in Old French, these are the changes involved: (1) a stop is lowered to a semivowel, (2) a velar is palatalized, (3) a surd is voiced.

I. A stop is lowered to a semivowel.—The steps from stop to semivowel are: stop, fricative, semivowel. All except Gröber and Grammont of the seven linguists quoted above who analyze this process, specify a close surd fricative, x or ç, as an intermediate stage. For example, LLat *nɔkte noctem* > GR *nɔxte, faktu factum* > GR *faxto*. Grammont voices the stop and passes through sonant fricative to semivowel, saying of the sonant stop that 'il s'est spirantisé sur place en un phonème qui ne pouvait que se confondre avec y [i], dont il était très voisin.'¹ In the *Traité* a similar statement is made. The divergence here is that all except these two regard the surd fricative as the first step toward the semivowel. The evidence favors this, as has been shown by other scholars.

Various devices were employed for indicating a post-dorsal fricative, e. g. Greek χ and roman *ch* and *h*.

(1) In Gaulish inscriptions the Latin *ct* was represented by *xt* e. g. in *Rextum* for Lat. *Rectum*. The Greek had developed a spirant pronunciation by the second century A. D.² Such then we may assume it was intended to represent in Gaulish.

(2) The British and Gaelic branches of Celtic also opened the k before t to a spirant, e. g. Lat. *octo*, OIr *ocht*, Welsh *wyth u:iθ*; Lat. *rectum*, OIr *recht*, OW *rhaith raiθ*. The Welsh θ seems to indicate a previous fricative stage of the k.

(3) In Irish and Welsh the labial stop also was fricated before dentals. Thus -pt- > xt/çt in the former and jθ in the latter, e. g.

¹ Grammont 355, *Le français moderne*, 1939.

² Edgar H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*² 77, Linguistic Society of America, 1940.

Lat. *septem*, OIr *secht*, Welsh *saith* *saiθ*. Brugmann assumes for this an intermediate stage of *ft*, which is logical in view of similar changes in Italic dialects, e. g. Lat. *scriptas*: Oscan *scriptas*, Lat. *scriptum*: Umbrian *screhto*.³ It is evident that the *p* could not have become a velar stop before it became *f* in the course of its ultimate conversion in Old Irish into a dorsal fricative and in Welsh into a palatal semivowel.

This change took place in a large part of Romania, but mostly in Celtic regions. Moreover, frication of other consonants confirms this as a normal tendency, e. g. Lat. *patrem* > OF 'peðre, Fr. *père*; Lat. *ripam* > OF 'rivə, Fr. *rive*, but only between sonant phonemes.

Where did the surd fricative originate? The retention (tension, *tenue*) of the *k* is out of the question since this is mute. The on-glide of the mute stop is usually sonant after a vowel, e. g. in Eng. *æt at*, Fr. *mɔk moque*.

What about the off-glide? In English the glide is suppressed between two voiceless stops, e. g. in *æktər actor* and may be also in French, e. g. in *akto:r acteur*, but not usually between words in French. For example there is a surd interval between the mute retentions of *k* and *t* in *chaque table*, and this is the surd release of the *k*. It contains therefore an incipient *x* or *ç*, according to the quality of the eliminated *k*. It would be the insistence on, and fortification of, this *k*-release as the simpler transition from the vowel to the crescent stop that eliminated the retention, i. e. the closure, of the first stop.

This, however, does not exclude the possibility of replacement of the *k* (retention and release) by a fortified surd on-glide, although this accords less with Latin and Romance phonological structure.

This elimination of the closure was the more easily effected because the *k* here occupies one of the weakest positions possible, that of a decrescent consonant between a vowel and a crescent consonant.

II. A velar is palatalized.—The chief divergence of opinion concerning palatalization concerns the manner in which it occurred. Was the velar drawn forward by the dental to palatal position? This, Nyrop, Guarnerio, Bourciez, Schwan-Behrens, Brunot, Dauzat, and Grammont favor by statement or implication.

³ Brugmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik* 1. 515.

Or was the dental drawn back to palatal position and did it then palatalize the velar? Thus Meyer-Lübke.

Or was there a reciprocal attraction that palatalized the two more or less synchronously? Thus Gröber and Miss Pope.

Dauzat refers to 'l'évolution du groupe *ct* en *yt* > *it* par l'intermédiaire d'une spirante analogue au *ch* dur allemand.'⁴ Grammont makes this comment concerning Dauzat's remark: 'Le *ch* dur allemand *x* étant une vélaire ou une vélopharangale n'aurait pas pu devenir *j*. Le *c* devant *t* était déjà prépalatal, c'est à dire articulé en avant du sommet de la voûte palatine . . .',⁵ but he does not state on what grounds he regards the *k* as 'déjà prépalatal.' Surely *ch* is not prepalatal before *t* in German *acht*.

Dauzat assumes that the velar stop was fricated before palatalization; *xt* should therefore be regarded as a step in the process of change. He omits the second step, viz. of palatalization before replacement by a semivowel, but it seems to the writer that this is implied. Grammont leaves no room for a surd fricative, which must have existed.

It is impossible to settle categorically the question which occurred first, the frication or the palatalization since there were no means of distinguishing a postdorsal from a mediodorsal stop or fricative. Nor is it possible now to determine what distinctions were made in *κ*, *γ*, and *χ* in Greek and *k* and *g* in Latin, when in contact with velar and with palatal vowels, since the same letters were used in both cases. Sturtevant concludes that these consonants were all velars remarking however: 'Before front vowels both *c* and *g* were probably articulated somewhat further forward, but there is no reason to suppose that the difference was important.'⁶ He symbolizes these by *k* and *g*, which in the IPA are ambiguous, since they cover *k* and *g* in *ku:l cool* and *ki:l keel*, *gu:s goose* and *gi:s geese*.

S. bases his conclusion for Greek upon a statement by Archinus ap. Syrianum that *k* is formed with the arched tongue pressed upon from the back of the mouth.⁷ Such a statement for an isolated *k* depends for its significance upon what form of the phoneme the

⁴ Dauzat, *Tableau 23*.

⁵ Grammont 355, *Le français moderne*, 1939.

⁶ Sturtevant, *Pronunciation* 90, 167-9.

⁷ Syrianus, *Commentary on the Metaphysics of Aristotle* (Kroll) 191. 29-35.

writer had in mind. To cover the various allophones of any phoneme in a modern language would require discriminations and would have, no doubt, in ancient languages also.

In view of the later palatalizations of the post-dorsal consonants before palatal vowels in Romance and Romaic we seem justified in assuming that in the early Christian era there were at least as great differences as we find, for example, in modern French, Spanish, Italian, German, Russian, and English.

Kent goes further than Sturtevant. He concludes that 'before palatal vowels (*e, i, y*) the palatal stop was sounded in Latin, before back vowels (*a, o, u*) the velar stop was sounded, but before *a* the consonant was made far less back than before *o* and *u* . . .' And referring to the early inscriptions: 'Hence came the practice of writing *c* before *e* and *i*, *k* before *a*, *q* before *o* and *u* . . .'⁸

On the other hand it is certainly not impossible for velar consonants to persist in contact with palatal vowels and vice versa. A phonetic nexus that may seem difficult and discordant in isolation may form an essential and distinguishing constituent of a particular language, somewhat as certain discords may of a particular musical composition.

Thus we find in Welsh the velar fricative *x* after palatal vowels, e. g. in *le:x llech* 'slate,' *gwi:x gwich* 'squeak.' Spanish has maintained the velar *x* before palatal vowels, e. g. in '*xesto gesto*, *xi'tano gitano*'. In Russian the palatalized consonants may precede any vowels, e. g. in *totke* 'aunt,' *'duzina* 'dozen,' but without more or less perceptible interglides such nexus can scarcely be maintained. Moreover *t*, initial in the syllable, does not palatalize normally in Gallo-Roman.

So we should expect the *k* before the *t* to retain its velar quality, and while we may at least assume that it might have been and probably was more or less palatal after the palatal vowels, it was not palatalized in this position, e. g. *siccum* > OF *sek* (Fr. *sec*). So it was certainly not at first palatalized after velar vowels, e. g. in *noctem*, *fructum*.

It is evident, moreover, that such differences of position as those for *k* after velar and after palatal vowels, might affect the resultant fricative. So that a prevelar *k*, e. g. in '*tekvt tectum*', might become *ç*, and a velar *k*, as in *okto octo*, might become *x*, as occurs in

⁸ Roland G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin* 52 f., 36 f., Linguistic Society of America, 1932.

German in similar cases, e. g. in *līct* *Licht* < IE *leuk-*, *axt* *acht* < IE *əktō:*.

The problem then is to account for the palatalization of x to ç. Miss Pope's conclusions are sound and complete. She says: 'In the inter-vocalic group velar and dental . . . the palatalisation of both elements took place in Gallo-Roman by mutual assimilation. The velar consonants were drawn forward into a palatal position by the influence of the juxtaposed dentals and in their turn palatalized the dentals. . . .' And further, referring to the entire group of palatalizations of k and g before all the predorsal and apical consonants: 'These palatalizations all took place after the *plosive* velars had become *fricative*, e. g. after -kr- had become yr, kt, xt . . . and consequently it was the fricative palatal [j] that was formed out of them . . .'⁹

Phonetically the striking and apparently anomalous phenomenon here is that the t, in the strongest of all positions, should succumb in any degree to the assimilative influence of the decrescent k, e. g. in *tractare* > GR *träç'ter*. Such phonological anomalies occur not infrequently to confound the phonetician. Somewhat similarly, in Pre-Aryan any oral constriction back of the alveoles caused a sequent dental s to move back to an alveolar position, e. g. IE ks > Skt. kf in *bhiakṣati* 'he eats'; Skt. ſt > ſt in *uṣṭa* 'burnt.' Even more to the point, a mutual assimilation of p and s to ff appears in Pre-Iranian, e. g. Pre-Aryan *napsu* > Gthav. *nafſu*: 'descendants' loc. The s has caused the p to fricative and a velar element in the p has retracted the s.

III. A surd is voiced.—The third change is from surd to sonant, i. e. from ç to j.

The chief difficulty here is the vocalization of a surd stop or fricative. All of the more recent studies, viz. those of Bourciez, Schwan-Behrens, Brunot, Pope, Dauzat and Grammont assume an intermediate stage of fricative j, but the point where sonance begins varies.

In five cases it is at fricative j. But Grammont makes the change directly from the stop c to j, citing Lat. *lacrima* > It. *lagrima* as an instance of surd to sonant stop in confirmation of -ct- > jt. But even in Italian there are many instances of the retention of the surd, e. g. Lat. *sacra*, *supra* > It. *sacra*, *sopra*. And especially,

⁹ Pope, *From Latin to Modern French* §§ 324, 319.

here we have a different setup, since the surd stop in *lacrima* is inclosed between sonants and has therefore no surd contact to impede its vocalization.

The main objection both to $\zeta > \zeta$ and $c > \zeta$ is that from earliest times the change was of the opposite character, i. e. a sonant preceding a surd stop in an intervocalic nexus became surd. For example $g > k$ in IE *juktó* 'harnessed' ptc., $d > t$ in IE *petsu* 'feet' loc. Brugmann says concerning this phonetic principle: 'Dieses Lautgesetz ist in allen idg. Einzelsprachen lebendig geblieben.'¹⁰ Its effects may be seen in derivatives of **juktó*, e. g. in Skt. *juktá*, Gk. *ζευκτό*, Lat. *junctu*, Lith. *junkta*.

Lat. *bs* and *bt* were regularly pronounced *ps* and *pt*, e. g. in *urbs*, *obtinuit*. Compare with these also Fr. *ɔptʒē obtient*, *apstene abstenez*, with a lenis *p*—as probably also in Latin. In Italian the stop was completely assimilated, e. g. *ot'ti:ne ottiene*, *aste'ne:te astenete*.

English, to be sure, deviates more than the Latin and its filiations, e. g. in *əb'teɪn obtain*, *əb'steɪn abstain*, but even here, while the retention of the sonant stop is sonant, the release is mute or surd, as it is also for the other sonant stops, e. g. for *g* in *'bægpærp bagpipe*.

On the other hand, neither in French nor English does a surd become sonant before an inviolate surd. For example, in sandhi $z > s$ (lenis) before *t* in Fr. *treize tables* and $d > t$ (lenis) before *p* in *grande porte*, and internally when the *s* became *z*, the *k* became *g*, as in Fr. *egzamē* < Lat. *eksamen exāmen*; and so too when the ζ is pronounced ζ , the *k* becomes *g* in Eng. *laɪg'zü:riəs luxurious*.

But the change in question is not one of vocalization, but of replacement. There is before the ζ a glide which may be surd or sonant, i. e. the sonance may stop as soon as the aperture begins to close, thus producing a surd interglide, or it may continue until the aperture diminishes to the fricative dimension, thus producing a sonant interglide.

If sonant, its quality will be affected by the position of the consonant and before a palatal will be $\dot{\iota}$. This subaudible $\dot{\iota}$ offers a more direct route than the ζ does from the vowel to the depalatalized *t*, since it is less closely attached to the palatal position. It was reinforced, and it replaced the ζ .

¹⁰ Brugmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*² 1. 623.

It is true that two or even three consonants occurred in some instances after the semivowel *j* in Old French. For example *ts* in *peits* (*poix*) < *picem*, *noits* (*noix*) < *nucem*; also *str* in *ku'noistre* (*connaître*) < *cognoscere*; and *nt* in *saint* (*saint*) < *sanctum*, *féint* (*feint*) < *finctum*, *puint* (*point*) < *punctum*. But the *j* is in none of these cases due to the following consonant—as it here appears, viz. as *t*, *s*, *n*—and is not articulated at the same locus. It could not therefore in any sense replace the consonant as an equivalent. It was reinforced, and it replaced the *ç*.

Similar changes occur in other Romance areas. Old Portuguese especially offers an instructive parallel and contrast.

Here also the *k* of *-ct-* was attracted to palatal position by the *t*, fricated to *ç* and then eliminated by the preceding *j*-glide, e. g. *lectum* > *leito*, *noctem* > *noite*. But contrary to the French the *k* was sometimes velarized and then lowered to *x/x̪* by a preceding velar vowel, unrounded or rounded. In this case also it was replaced by the preceding glide, but now the latter, instead of *j*, was a semi-vocalic *u* after *a*, and *u* after *o*. The familiar phoneme (rounded *u*), as was to be expected, replaced the *u*, unfamiliar as a phoneme, since the *u* and *u* differ only in their labial configuration. Examples: *actum* > *auto*, *doctum* > *douto*.²¹

In adjacent Celtic regions, also, the fricative stage of this change is clearly manifested in Gaelic and British, e. g. *ekt* > *çɪθ* in Welsh '*perfaiθ* : Lat. *perfectus*, *okt* > *ɔ:ɪθ* in *dɔ:ɪθ* : *doctus*, *ukt* > *u:ɪθ* in *fru:ɪθ* : *fructus*.

It seems unnecessary to assume in these cases as intermediary between the close surd and the sonant semivowels a fricative sonant in violation of the principle stated by Brugmann. Neither Guarnerio nor Meyer-Lübke do so. It is also hard to see on what grounds Grammont can base his voicing of *c* to *j* before the *t*.

Accordingly the formulae offered for the changes in question are:

1. (pal. vow.) + *ct-* = *kt* > *çt* > *çt* > *jt*
2. (vel. vow.) + *ct-* = *kt* > *xt* > *çt* > *jt*

These formulae might have been broadened to include *g* as well as *k*, and the other apicals (*d*, *s*, *l*, *r*) as well as *t*, but it would carry us beyond the scope of this article.

They differ from all except Miss Pope's in making the assimila-

²¹ E. B. Williams, *From Latin to Portuguese* 84 f., Philadelphia, 1938.

tion of the k and t mutual and synchronous and from Miss Pope's and most of the others in dispensing with the fricative j.

The salient points of the change are:

- (1) The mutual attraction of the postdorsal x and the apical or predorsal t.
- (2) The suppression of a fricative by a semivocalic on-glide.

EDWIN B. DAVIS

Rutgers University

THE FARCICAL ELEMENTS IN *INFERNO*, CANTOS XXI-XXIII

The atmosphere of these cantos has best been described by Vossler, *Die göttliche Komödie* II, 695 seq., who characterizes it as 'farcical' ('höllisches Lustspiel,' 'schnurriges Durcheinander,' 'drastische Situationskomik,' 'Posse'): it is an atmosphere in which sinners and guards (the devils) alike, and even the two poet-wanderers, are for the moment on one level—all subjected to the comedy whose setting is a trough of pitch. But Vossler has failed to explain *why* Dante chose to insert this strange interlude, unique of its kind, into his solemn poem, introducing thereby a break in the otherwise grim tone of the *Inferno*; he fails to show the ties which nonetheless bind the farcical episode to the framework of the *cantica*.

As is always the case with Dante's artistic devices, there is an intellectual justification for this respite granted the reader (much akin in tone to the atmosphere of relaxation present in the farcical scenes of the mystery plays—which, too, are built around the escapades of devils): this lies in the nature of the crime itself with which Dante deals in the three cantos. *Baratteria* (which is only approximately rendered by such modern terms as embezzlement, graft, low intrigue, misuse of power and money) is essentially a *petty* crime—one of which any man may be 'capable.' Therefore do we have this levelling of sinners and their guardians: the delinquents and the authorities are equally unheroic in their reciprocal attempts at cheating: those who punish in the name of the law, as well as those who are punished, form *one* contemptible crew—above whom there stands out no great figure. For Dante (who, by

his curiosity, has unleashed the riot¹ and confusion, the "drastische Situationskomik") goes so far as to include himself in the farce, when for a moment he seems to resign himself humorously to the prevailing atmosphere, as he joins the parade of the devils, that parody of knightly corteges: *Ma nella chiesa Co' santi, e in taverna co' ghiottoni* ('one must howl with the wolves'); nor does Vergil himself escape quite unscathed, since he falls a victim to one of the devils' tricks.

Indeed, this overpowering force of an unheroic situation, which stains even the noblest, is precisely the definition of the farce. In the purest examples of the farce (from its beginnings with the O.Fr. *Gargon et l'Aveugle* to the masterpiece of this genre, the *Avocat Pathelin*), no character is allowed to rise above the standard level of mediocre wickedness; no higher principle of a transcendental, or even of a common moral nature, is allowed to appear on the horizon: with the utter ruthlessness of untranscendental comedy man is represented as singularly stripped of his suprahuman qualities—wallowing in the pitch and mire of his infrahuman nature. Not only do we see *homo homini lupus* (everyone cheats the other); man himself is *lupus*, no divine grace shines through the farce. It has always appeared to me a great problem that the same Middle Ages, which elaborated the highest forms of mystic, religious and transcendental poetry, could also create the most barren and shallow picture of man. But to raise the question is to answer it: in the vast hierarchy of human types more or less illumined by Divine Grace, there must needs be a place for the variant of the entirely God-forsaken.²

¹ It is perhaps not too bold to assume that the idea of the 'riot' was suggested to Dante by a verbal association: *baratta* 'riot' (the word used by his Vergil xxi, 63)—*barattieri* 'barators.' The pedantry which is so often encouraged by the law of the *contrappasso* is, in this case, surely not mitigated by the suggestion of a verbal origin. And yet it is still possible perhaps to sense, in the sentence that must have flashed before Dante's mind ('The barattieri must be presented in a baratta!'), a trace of the innate *hated* against the sin in question. Indeed the whole law of the *contrappasso* or *talion* is the result of a transformation of hatred against a personal enemy (who has sinned against one) into hatred against the principle of this sin itself; and from this hatred emanate juridical and theological consequences.

² It would seem, then, that our own time, devoid as it is of strong religious belief, harbors a sentimental opposition against the naked harsh-

The farce reduces the low nature of man to a hopeless *absurdum* of futile low intrigue and bodily impurity, offering this picture with no relief for the spectator. It is characteristic that Dante, when he quietly reviews (beginning of canto XXIII: *io pensava così*, etc.) the confusion of tumbling, sprawling bodies which he had witnessed and in which he had become unwittingly entangled, should have been reminded of the 'Aesopian' fable in which a powerful *tertius gaudens* or *troisième larron* outwits two small deceitful beasts—one of which kills off the other. In this devil-scene, the parallel to the *tertius gaudens* is ultimately the pitch of Hell (and in the foreground there is parallelism of movements).³ Here the ultimately triumphant force is that of Evil. It is to be noted, too, that Dante formulates the gist of this scene in terms of a *fable*—that rationally prosaic genre which, like the farce, reduces all illusions about mankind *ad absurdum*; in this the fable differs from the *Tiersage* (e. g. the *Renart* epic), whose comfortably and naïvely sinning protagonist, an anticipation of the unheroic *Panurge* type,⁴ is not 'grace-forsaken' as are the characters of a farce.

Dante, well-aware of the kinship between farce and fable, knows also the fitting place that should be allotted to these in the hierarchy of genres. In this case, he has woven a farce into the contexture; but we are clearly given to understand that this comic scene, devoted to the debased aspects of human life, is only an interlude: at the beginning of canto XXI he alludes to incidents *che la mia commedia cantar non cura* (this is slightly reminiscent of the wilful *de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme* of the great Spanish epic nar-

ness of untranscendental farce (this opposition may also explain why commentators are so reserved in their appreciation of these cantos: note the exceptionally cursory "argument" with which Grandgent introduces canto XXII); we can tolerate such a theme only when sugar-coated—i. e., alternating with 'idealism,' as in modern musical comedies and burlesque shows. To the degree that we have lost the fierce resoluteness of faith, we must adopt a sentimentalized approach to what Dante could look upon unveiled in all its God-forsakenness and present without extenuations.

³ Grandgent's comment in this connection is as follows:

"The fall of the two grappling fiends into the pitch is a reproduction of the plunge of the tethered quadrupeds into the water; and their rescue, as they are hooked out by their mates, is a counterpart of the seizure of the frog and the rat by the kite."

⁴ Cf. my article "Die Branche VIII des *Roman de Renart*," *Arch. rom.* 1940, p. 206 seq.

rator), intimating thereby that the farce scene which is to follow may be considered as a whimsical inclusion—as a *farcime* (in the literal sense of farce): a 'stuffing' for his *Commedia*. Moreover, in spite of their partial involvement in this scene, the two wanderer-poets cannot but stand aloof from the farcical interlude into which they have strayed: Dante's temporary 'relaxation' was primarily benevolent; Dante's guilt consisted only of (artistic and moral) curiosity: in itself a noble motive. And from the first moment after he had entered this *bolgia* (xxi, 27: *cui paura subita sgagliarda*) to the last (xxiii, 23: *i' ho pavento*) he depicts himself as frightened (as would be any righteous man faced with moral impurity); at times his fears are presented comically, but it seems clear that he is experiencing a real terror of the defiling contact of vulgarity. His main attitude seems to be that he, the man, should flee from the vile (xxi, 25: *l'uom cui tarda Di veder ciò che gli convien fuggire*), and this the two poets manage finally to do (xxiii, 33: *Noi fuggirem l'imaginata caccia*). Here the problem of the artist and moralist who must *see* the gross reality needed for creation, without being caught therein, comes to a solution: flight is the only means for the preservation of his purity.⁵ But in

⁵ The final escape of Dante from the wiles of the devils suggests to Grandgent's mind "a bit of autobiography": "In reality . . . , as in the Comedy, he had a narrow escape from infernal machinations." But if Dante had wished to introduce an autobiographical allusion, he could have done so already in canto xxI, where he describes the crime of barratry—for which he himself had been sentenced to death by the Florentine authorities; here as nowhere else was an opportunity to suggest a personal parallel. Yet Dante failed to take advantage of this opportunity—as an artist he purposely eliminates from his work all elements extraneous thereto. This reticence on Dante's part, however, does not seem to deter the supporters of the biographical approach.

And when they are so modest as only to include "a bit" of biography in their analysis, I am afraid their attempt will meet with utter defeat. They single out only one aspect of a situation in Dante's life and parallel it with a similar incident in Dante's Comedy, without asking themselves how far this parallel applies, or whether an emphasis on the aspect in common between the two may not vitiate the true significance of the situation in the work of art. As for the first: how does the personal experience of the man Dante, who barely escaped seizure by the Florentine authorities, square with this scene in the Inferno where the barrators are ridiculed along with the authorities, and where Dante remains aloof both from the sinners and from their persecutors? And to emphasize the 'narrow escape from

a *pure* farce, escape from the eddies of vulgarity is forever denied to all.

Another element in Dante's peculiar adaptation of the farcical is the theological justification which is introduced. Several times during this interlude Dante has taken care to emphasize the pre-ordained and providential in the devilish horse-play that is enacted: the comical rôle the devils must play is willed by God. For, unless God so wills it, they have no power on man; Vergil is assured that he is secure from their attacks:

"Credi tu, Malacoda, qui vedermi
 Esser venuto," disse il mio maestro,
 "Securo già da tutti i vostri schermi,
 Senza voler divino e fato destro?
 Lasciane andar, chè nel cielo è voluto
 Ch'io mostri altrui questo cammin silvestro . . .

and in our scene the pride of Malacoda is dashed immediately after he has heard God's will: he is forced to drop his pitch-fork. It is well known that in Christian drama, the Devil, the power of Evil, is regularly represented as a comic character, precisely because he is conquered in principle by the Good (it is this optimistic trend of Christian dramatic art which is responsible for its basically undramatic nature: cf. Lanson, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la trag. fr.*). In this epic poem, too, concerned as it is with the fate of humanity, the Devil has his well-allotted place and limit: the lines put into his mouth (xxi, 112):

Ier, più oltre cinqu' ore che quest' otta,
 Mille dugento con sessantasei
 Anni compiè, che qui la via fu rotta

date the advent of Christ's rule with mathematical precision (1260 years + 1 day + 5 hours have passed since the death of Christ, at which every moment the might of Hell was forever broken). The limit of the Devil's power is set by Providence (xxiii, 55):

Chè l'alta Provvidenza, che lor volle
 Porre ministri della fossa quinta,
 Poder di partirs' indi a tutti tolle.

'infernal machinations' is to mislead us in regard to the real elements of the conflict to which Dante is given up in this scene: i. e. on the one hand his intellectual and artistic curiosity, on the other, his desire to avoid contact with vulgarity. Not only does the biographical approach fail to help us better to understand the scene: it leads to absolute misunderstanding.

Thus the farce introduced by Dante is God-willed, God-limited, God-judged. It has a definite place of its own in the Holy poem, to achieve which 'Heaven and Earth have collaborated.' Dante could shape the remotest corners of his creation protected by Divine blessing.⁶

LEO SPITZER

DECAMERON VIII, 9: CARAPIGNARE

The word occurs in that hilarious account, full of *gergo* and obscure double meanings, of a practical joke played upon Maestro Simone doctor, who falls victim to Bruno and Buffalmacco and learns at their hands the meaning of "andare in corso." Those two inveterate pranksters have got their man just about where they want him:

Il medico, che oltre modo disiderava d'andare in corso, non mollò mai che egli divenne amico di Buffalmacco, il che agevolmente gli venne fatto, e cominciògli a dare le più belle cene ed i più be' desinari del mondo, ed a Bruno con lui altressi, ed essi si carapignavano come que' signori li quali, sentendogli bonissimi vini e di grossi capponi e d'altre buone cose assai, gli si tenevano assai di presso e senza troppi inviti, dicendo sempre che con uno altro ciò non farebbono, si rimanevan con lui.

Fanfani's note is typical of dozens of others in his commentary:

si carapignavano come que' signori. Parlare oscuro e forse erroneo; non avendolo niun commentatore spiegato né dettoci chi diavol possano essere que' signori, né sapendolo io indovinare.

Massera closes his *Nota to the Scrittori d'Italia* edition of the *Decameron* with this comment on the word:

Salutiamo anche senza rimpianto una mezza dozzina di vocaboli che, nati da una sbadataggine di amanuense, erano entrati nel lessico per colpa di quella non mai abbastanza deplorata idolatria per le deformazioni dei testi a penna: *pocofila, trisorier, giudicio, sanctio, balco, borrana* . . . e più straordinario di tutti, l'impagabile verbo *carapignare!* Questo è introdotto da *L* [the famous Manelli ms.] e dalla vulgata nel passo di *II, 166, 24*: "ed essi si carmignavano come que' signori": in *B* [the Berlin ms. which serves him as basis for his edition] la quinta lettera della parola fu espunta (ed il punto di espunzione fu creduto dal Mannelli costituire la gamba di

⁶ On the well-devised farcical names of the devils cf. *Rom. Rev.* XXXIV, 256.

una *p*) mentre sulla quarta e su parte della quinta l'amanuense tracciò segni che sembrano voler trasformare le lettere stesse in una *m*, ma non così bene, che le due aste anteriori non tradiscano ad incerta lettura un' *a*; d'onde appunto *carapignavano*.

Finally Michele Barbi in his fundamental essay on the text of the *Decamerone* (1927),¹ in part a critical review of the Massera edition, questioned Massera's alteration of *carapignare* to *carmignare* and observed:

... contro l'ipotesi del Massera sta il fatto che noi non possiamo far derivare tutti i manoscritti che leggono *carapignavano* o *carpignavano* o in simil modo da Mn [Mannelli]: sono molti e di varie tradizioni, e fra questi è anche l'autorevolissimo Parigino 482, che è sì del medesimo gruppo di Mn-B, ma proviene dal capostipite per via affatto indipendente. Non può il Boccaccio, essendo qui in vena di foggiare nomi e vocaboli insoliti, aver derivato *carapignare* o *carpignare* (nel senso stesso di *carminare* o *carmignare*) dal francese antico *charpignier*? o averlo trovato nell'uso per un incrocio di *carmignare* con *carpire*? e se *carmignare* o *carpignare* dicono lo stesso nel senso proprio, non può averli usati indifferentemente anche nel senso figurato qualunque sia? Io credo che se il Massera vorrà salvare il suo *carmignare*, sarà costretto a pensare a una trascrizione del *Decamerone* di mano del Boccaccio nella quale l'autore stesso a *carapignare* abbia sostituito la lezione ch'egli Massera preferisce.²

Now a very clear photographic reproduction of the passage in the Berlin ms. where Massera claims to read *carmignare*, reveals an unmistakable *carapignavano* to us. It may be that the original shows erasures which justify Massera's remarks. Fortunately however the studies on the complete manuscript tradition of the *Decameron* have now reached a point where we can distinguish several other manuscripts equal in authority to the Berlin Ms. And in every one of these we find the form *carapignavano*. In fact every ms. of the 14th Century has this except one, which has a variant reading supported by no other: *si gli facevano*. Later mss. reflect misunderstandings and interpretive readings such as "si godevano," "si rifacevano," "si raccompagnavano" "si cham-

¹ In *Studi di filologia italiana*, I, 9 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 49-50. Since we have witnessed Fanfani's perplexity over the construction *come que' signori*, it is appropriate to quote Barbi's note which offers the correct explanation:

"Perché, nello stesso luogo, mette il Massera punto e virgola fra *come que' signori*? Non abbiamo qui una formula corrispondente al *quippe qui*, come coloro che ecc.?"

pignavano." One ms. of the 15th Century has the form "scarpignavano."

In the various notes to this word before Massera there has been little understanding of its meaning; instead there have been offered only guesses at a possible meaning. (While it is true, as Fanfani notes, that our story *in general* is full of a *parlare oscuro*, still this word can hardly be a case in point, occurring as it does outside of direct discourse.) But Massera's reading cannot stand and we must face the form *carapignare*.

Its meaning and derivation become clear if, to the philological information which heretofore has been exclusively offered, we add the linguistic knowledge acquired in the last generation, i. e. the materials contained in the REW and the FEW. In the first we find the entry (7663):

*scarpināre*³ C Gl L 5, 399, 11 'schaben':

Rum. *scarpina* 'kratzen,' engad. *sk'arpiner* 'zupfen,' mail. *scarpina* 'zerzaust.'— + PILUS 6508: sp. *escrapelarse* 'sich zausen.'—Mit Suff. W.: piem. *skarpenté*, gen. *skarpentá*, engad. *sk'arpil'er* 'zerzausen.'

The FEW s. v. *carpere*, I, 1, b-c, lists O. Prov. *carpenar* 'effilocher du lin,' O. Fr. *charpiner* (hapax of the 14th cent.), dial. Fr. (é)charpi(g)ner 'faire de la charpie, déchirer, égratigner, mettre en menus morceaux, tourmenter, chercher querelle, se disputer' and (é)charpiller 'mettre en charpie, déchiqueter,' and remarks on the suffix:

Das suffix von b schwankt (-enar, -inar, -igner, -eigner). Der ausgangspunkt ist sehr wahrscheinlich nicht überall der gleiche. Sicher ist, dass sowohl *carminare* (besonders im süden) als auch *peigner* an der entstehung des worttypus beteiligt sind. . . . e ist mit dem verbalsuffix -iller gebildet, das besonders in *fendiller* in einem semantisch sehr naheliegenden verbum lebt.

Barbi, who mentions the Fr. word, was evidently on the right track, but we may be even more positive in our affirmation: the presence of a Milanese *scarpiná*, Piedm. *skarpentá*, Engad. *sk'arpiner*-*sk'arpil'er*, all parallel to Fr. (es)charpigner -iller, allows us to

³ Why -i-? The word is attested only once and then in an Anglo-Saxon gloss (cf. *Arch. f. lat. Lex.* I, 287) which does not permit of any inference. The Romance reflections point as well to -i- (O. Prov. *carpenar*), as to -i- (Rum. *scarpiná*).

assume the existence of an Italian (and Florentine) **(s)carpignare*, **(s)carpigliare*, which would represent an **(ex-) carp-in(i)are* (cf. also It. *carminare*, *carmignare*, Parma *skarminar*, REW s. v. *carminare*) and an **(ex-) carp-iliare* respectively. The *scarpinare* of the Anglo-Latin gloss is in fact nothing but a Romance **ex-carp-inare* (Meillet-Ernout, *Dict. étym. de la langue lat.* s. v. *carpō*)—cf. *scoriscus* = *ex-coruscus*. For our verb it is necessary to assume neither a formation of a loanword from French nor a blend with *carmignare*. Boccaccio has simply used a genuine popular or dialectal word which may possibly yet turn up in other parts of Italy.⁴ The *scarpignare* of the 15th cent. variant shows an *s-* which is in line with the forms listed above and serves to prove that at this late period the word was still understood.

Thus, with a clear indication of the literal meaning *si grattavano* before us but with no other example of the Florentine *carapignarsi* at hand, we can only depend on the context to define the figurative meaning which the verb must unquestionably have here. Bruno and Buffalmacco are jubilant. They have just brought the doctor to the point of seeking out Buffalmacco himself, and they can now gull him properly in their usual good team work. With the fine wines and fat capons and many other good things spread before them by their very victim, they are “ tickled to death ” in anticipation of greater success. *Si carapignavano* expresses this contentment. Applied to this pair of mutual abettors and admirers, the verb is surely *reciprocal*: *si grattavano l'un l'altro dalla contentezza* seems to be the idea. The standard *grattarsi la pancia* as an analogue helps to glimpse the meaning. *Carapignarsi* is probably a stronger expression (as *carminarsi* instead of *grattarsi* would be). To make it *reciprocal* instead of *reflexive* probably added much comedy to it. One is reminded of a passage in Marot which seems to provide something of a similar situation :

Ce Huet et Sagon se jouent
Par escript l'un l'autre se louent

⁴ Cf. meanwhile Piedm. *carpúgn*, *carpógn*, Milan *carpógn* ‘arido’ (“*propriam. ‘rammendo,’ deverbale di mil. *carpogná* ‘rammendare,’ il quale pare un derivato di *carpere*, come fr. a. *charpignier* . . . , con senso mutato per influsso di mil. *poncigná* ‘agucchiare,’” A. Levi, *Diz. etim. del dial. piem.*), cf. also Salvioni, *Rev. d. dial. rom.* v, 177; Milan *carpiáss* ‘rapprendersi, cagliare, gelare’ may be a **carpigliare*.*

Et semble (tant ils s'entreflatteut)
Deux vieulx asnes qui s'entregrattent.⁵

In fact, Marot's *s'entregratter* seems to be the best possible gloss to Boccaccio's *carapignarsi*.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON
LEO SPITZER

BIAUS NIÉS

Bloch (*Dictionnaire Étymologique*), after giving the literal sense of the adjectives *niais* as "pris au nid," finds the modern, figurative meaning—perhaps relying on Littré—only "depuis le xv^e siècle." There is an example, however, in Godefroy's *Complément* from a thirteenth century manuscript, Chartres 620, which Godefroy wrongly identifies as a copy of *Dolopathos*. Actually this is a fragmentary version of the rhymed *Roman des Sept Sages*, and our word occurs both here and in the only complete manuscript known of that work, Bib. Nat. fonds français 1553:

Et dont n'est il bien fols niais,
Quant il le [= la pelote] giete et cort aprés?

Moreover, although these two manuscripts are of the thirteenth century, the poem itself is usually dated in the twelfth.¹

That in any case the figurative meaning of even the substantive is surely as old as the thirteenth century is indicated by a pun in Adam le Bossu's *Jeu de la Feuillée*, a pun which seems somehow to have escaped notice. In that play Walet, referred to as *sot*, *beste* and in need of Saint Acaire, patron of fools, keeps addressing everyone indiscriminately as "biaus niés," whereupon the Monk, mocking him, uses the same expression—more appropriately—in speaking to Walet himself. Now the latest editor of the play, Langlois,

⁵ In the *epistre "Fripelippe, valet de Marot, à Sagon."*

¹ The Chartres ms. reads: Et dont n'est il bien fol niés / Quant il la gite et cort aprés. See *Le Roman des Sept Sages*, ed. Jean Misrahi, Paris, 1933, l. 2447, and for the Chartres ms. Hugh Smith's diplomatic copy in *RR*. III, 1912, l. 286. The date of the latter is discussed by P. Meyer in *Bulletin de la SATF*, 1894, p. 37. On derivations from *nidus* meaning "child," see Ivan Pauli, "Enfant," "Gargon," "Fille" dans les langues romanes, Lund, 1919, pp. 352-354.

like his predecessors, is content to gloss *niés* by *neveu* and to dismiss the expression in his notes as "un mot de Walet." But, although the words "sœur" and "frère" were frequently employed in medieval French in greeting strangers, *niés* (= nephew) is recorded only in its literal meaning. It seems clear therefore that when Walet says "biaus *niés*" the audience, who also heard "biaus *nialis*" (*ai* in this position had of course become open *e* before the thirteenth century), smiled both at the fool's ascription to others of his own folly and at his impudence in thus addressing such worthies as Maître Henri, the Monk, and Saint Acaire.

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

NAZI UND SOZI*

I

Daß *Nazi* eine Abkürzung von *Nationalsozialist* ist,¹ ist auch in der englisch sprechenden Welt weithin bekannt, viel weniger aber, daß diese "Abkürzung" gleichzeitig als parodistische Replik auf das Jahrzehnte alte, sehr gebräuchliche Spottwort *Sozi* (Abkürzung für *Sozialdemokrat*) geprägt wurde. Für jeden, der sich zur Zeit des Aufkommens des Nationalsozialismus im deutschen Sprachgebiet aufhielt, bestand darin der Witz des Wortes. Obwohl Leo Spitzer 1934 in "La vie du mot *nazi* en Français"² auf diesen Ursprung hingewiesen hat, scheinen seine Ausführungen, wohl wegen der Entlegenheit des Erscheinungsortes, unter Germanisten kaum Beachtung gefunden zu haben.

Danach war *Nazi* als parodistische Analogie-Bildung zu *Sozi*

* Dieser Aufsatz ist der, dem Rahmen dieser Zeitschrift angepaßte, zweite Teil eines Vortrags "Word Formation by Shortening and Affixation," gehalten am 17. Juli 1943 an der University of Wisconsin anlässlich des gemeinsamen Meetings der Linguistic Society und American Dialect Society. Der erste Teil erschien unter dem zitierten Titel in *American Speech*, XVIII (1943), 200-207.

¹ Und zwar eine Verkürzung des Wortes auf seine ersten zwei Silben, aber nicht eine Zusammenziehung aus "Nationalsozialist," wie Webster's *New International Dictionary*, Second edition, es darstellt.

² *Le Français Moderne*, II (1934), 263-268.

besonders geeignet, weil die bärische Koseform *Nazi* für den katholischen Namen *Ignaz* im Oberdeutschen leicht einen komischen Beigeschmack hatte; Schmeller, *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* führt die Redensart *Haßs(heiß)*, *Nazi* an, "üblicher Ausruf, wenn man sich gebrannt hat," Hermann Fischer, *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch* erklärt *Nazi* als einen spöttischen Ausdruck für "dummer, täppischer Kerl," und nach dem *Schweizerischen Idiotikon* bedeutet *Nazi* "wunderliche Person." Ferner sei *Nazi* in Wien (um 1900) scherhafte Umschreibung für das persönliche Fürwort der ersten Person gewesen: *Nazi (Nazerl) tut das nicht* habe Professor Spitzers Vater im familiären Umgangston verwendet.—Soweit jener Artikel.

Warum aber hat der Beiklang des Kindischen innerhalb des traditionellen Gefühlswertes "dumm, (bärisch-)tölpisch," der im Oberdeutschen dem unpolitischen *Nazi* anhaftete, so stark überhand genommen, daß das Ergebnis jene scherhaft infantile Ausdrucksweise wurde? (*Nazi tut das nicht* mit dem Sinn *Ich tue das nicht* ist ja deutlich Nachahmung der Kindersprache.) Es röhrt dies offenbar von der Verknüpfung dieses Namens mit zwei Gestalten der oberdeutschen dramatischen und literarischen Tradition her. Die wollen wir hier bekannt machen.

Johann Nestroy's Posse *Eulenspiegel*² (1838) erlangte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, von Wien ausgehend, ungeheure Popularität. Ihr Verfasser, Liebling und Meister der Wiener komischen Bühne, spielte in ihr die Rolle des *Natzi*. Diese Modernisierung der alten *Thaddädl*-Figur, die eine Erneuerung *Kasperls* und *Hanswursts* gewesen war,³ wurde selbst eine typische Gestalt. Otto Rommel, der beste Kenner oberdeutscher Volksstück-Tradition, berichtet:

Die Aufführung dieser Posse . . . muß ein Fest des Übermutes gewesen sein . . . Nestroy spielte den "Thaddädl" *Natzi* . . . Aber wo blieb die harmlos kindliche Fröhlichkeit . . . ! Der langmächtige Nestroy [im Kostüm eines Knaben] redet dumm, lacht tölpisch, wundert sich . . . , wird geprügelt und erhebt ein entsetzliches Zetergeschrei . . . Aber er hat Momente, wo man sich sagt: Dieser blöde Junge ist gar nicht eigentlich

² In Johann Nestroy, *Sämtliche Werke*, hgg. von Fritz Bruckner und Otto Rommel, IX (1927). Wir zitieren diese Ausgabe als *SW*.

³ Vgl. u. a. Rommel, Johann Nestroy, *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wiener Volkskomik*. In *SW*, xv (1930), 263 ff., ferner das Kapitel "Kasperl und Thaddädl."

“dumm,” ja er überrascht oft durch entschieden geistreiche Bemerkungen . . . Man erkennt: er ist nicht “dumm” im intellektualistischen Sinn des Wortes, er ist mehr stumpf . . . —hat aber längst gelernt, sich in einer Einschätzung wohlzufühlen, die alle Vorteile der Verantwortungslosigkeit gewährt. Dieser Nazi war tölpisch und verschmitzt zugleich . . . Das gab allerdings eine . . . Komik, die . . . von Nestroy gespielt, immer wieder genossen werden konnte . . . Der freche Knabe Willibald⁴ ist das Endglied der langen Reihe, die mit Nazi beginnt.⁵

... dieses . . . unbedeutende Stück wurde eine der erfolgreichsten Possen Nestroy's überhaupt und ging . . . Jahr für Jahr über die Bühne. So groß war die komische Gewalt, die von diesen beiden Künstlern [Nestroy und Scholz] ausging.⁶

“Jahr für Jahr” bedeutet hier den Zeitraum von 1838 bis 1860.⁷ Dies macht begreiflich, daß die Rolle sich dem Bewußtsein jener Zeit so tief einprägen konnte, daß *Nazi* *tut das nicht* in die ironisch scherzende Umgangssprache übergehen konnte, wie so viele andere Wendungen und Typen aus Nestroy's Stücken. In Mittel- und Norddeutschland mag die Wirkung weniger nachhaltig gewesen sein: Nestroy spielte den Nazi 1843 in Breslau, 1844 in Berlin; für die lange Reihe seiner berühmten Gastspiele in Norddeutschland nach 1844 haben wir keine Zusammenstellung.

War in Nestroy's Darstellung das Kindische innerhalb der Assoziationen betont, die sich an den Namen *Nazi* knüpfen, und diese Gesamtheit von Assoziationen selbst durch satirische Untertöne zweideutig gemacht, so stellt ein anderes österreichisches Werk der Zeit die wohlwollend lächelnde Auffassung eines unreifen, ungewitzten bärurischen *Nazi* dar: Josef Missons vielgelesenes Versepos *Dá Náz, a niederösterreichischer Bauernbui, geht in d'Fremd* (1860).⁸ Lange Auszüge daraus waren noch in den 1920er Jahren in den offiziellen

⁴ In *Die schlimmen Buben in der Schule*, SW, XIII; bis in die letzten Jahre immer wieder in öffentlichen und Liebhaber-Aufführungen gespielt.

⁵ SW, xv, 263 ff.

⁶ SW, IX, 565.

⁷ Dies zeigt die Statistik der Aufführungen von Nestroy's Werken an drei Wiener Theatern, SW, xv, 399-419. Sie schließt mit 1862, Nestroy's Todesjahr. Über Wiener Aufführungen nach 1862 wissen wir nur so viel, daß im Rahmen des 48 Abende umfassenden Nestroy-Zyklus des Carl-Theaters im Jahre 1881 auch *Eulenspiegel* wieder auf die Bühne kam. (Vgl. M. Necker, *Johann Nestroy* in Band IX der Ganghofer-Chiavacci'schen Ausgabe von Nestroy's Werken [1891], 211.)

⁸ Auch in Daberkows Allgemeiner Nationalbibliothek. Vgl. Nagl, Zeidler, Castle, *Deutschösterreichische Literaturgeschichte*, II, 607 ff. und *passim*.

österreichischen Gymnasial-Lesebüchern enthalten. Erinnerungen an den Knaben Parzival, Meier Helmbrecht, Simplizius Simplizissimus umspinnen die Hauptfigur mit einer Reiner Tor-Atmosphäre, in der das Alberne gemildert erscheint.

Nestroys Natzi und Missons Naz waren als literarische Figuren zur Zeit der Entwicklung des Nationalsozialismus schon vergessen; dem Namen aber haftete der Beiklang des Lächerlichen, manchmal des Verächtlichen, noch an. Dies ist erwiesen durch den—unpolitischen—Gebrauch in Witzblättern und eine Fülle von Wörterbuchdefinitionen und -Beispielen. Wir führen hier noch einige an, um den ganzen Bereich der spöttischen Anwendung des Namens sichtbar zu machen: Das *Schwäbische Wörterbuch* (1914) gibt mit den Redensarten *dümmer als N.*, *der tappet N.* die Erklärungen "Gaunername," "Wer Absonderlichkeiten hat," "heimtückischer, bösartiger Mensch" und die Wendung *Es ist recht, N.* als "höhnische Antwort auf einen Befehl," "Schelte für einen Menschen, der etwas falsch gemacht, der einen geärgert hat." Der Nachtragsband bringt ferner *Näzl*, *Drecknäzl*, "Schmutzfink."

Das *Schweizerische Idiotikon*, IV (1901) bezeichnet *Näz*, *Näzel*, *Näzeli*, *Näzi* als Personennamen und Appellativum. Maskulin gebraucht, bedeutet es "Toller," *Zapfe-Nazi* (n.) einen beschränkten Menschen.

Martin-Lienhart, *Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten* (1899) schließlich führt unter *Naz*, . . . Koseform *Nazi* u. a. die Redensarten *du N. du dümmer!*, *du bis^te tauwer [tauber] N.* und die Bezeichnungen *Drecknazel*, *Käsnazel*, "Junge, der Käse ist und sich dabei . . . beschmiert," *Krappeⁿnazi*, "Spottnamen für einen zerlumpten Menschen" an.⁹

So gehörte *Nazi* zu jenen Vornamen, die, nicht ernst genommen, oft einen bestimmten abfällig oder humoristisch gesehenen Menschentypus bezeichnen. Man erinnere sich etwa *Kasperls* (*Kaspar*), des albernen, unreifen *Thaddädl* (*Thaddäus*), des verblüfften, ungeschickten *Nannerl*,¹⁰ (Koseform von *Anna*), des zaghafoten *Veidl* (*Veit*),¹¹ des Clowns *August* und der festen Fügung *verrückte Gretl* oder *Gredl*.

⁹ Alle diese Wortverbindungen waren um 1914 in Freiburg (Baden) noch durchaus üblich. (Laut Dr. Bernhard Nebel, University of Rochester Medical School.)

¹⁰ Vgl. Schmeller-Frommann, I, 1745, ferner die Dialektwörterbücher von Hügel und Castelli. ¹¹ Vgl. Schmeller-Frommann, I, 692.

Abkürzung des Parteinamens, parodistische Analogie und alltägliches Schimpfwort zugleich, war *Nazi* in den Anfängen des Nationalsozialismus eine willkommene Waffe der Gegner,¹² besonders im Süden,¹³ der Heimat der Bewegung. Die in Bayern und Württemberg erscheinenden und im ganzen deutschen Sprachgebiet verbreiteten Witzblätter *Jugend*, *Simplizissimus*, *Fliegende Blätter* und *Meggendorfer Blätter* hatten aber den in einer vagen Weise lächerlichen Namen *Nazi* auch schon längst im Norden vertraut gemacht, als er zunächst von der Sozialdemokratie als Revanche für *Sozi* aufgegriffen wurde.¹⁴ So verbreitete er sich rasch als Spottwort und dann als handlich kurze Bezeichnung wie einst *Sozi*. Die den politischen Begriff umwitternde Bedeutungsschwere, der täglich hundertfältige Gebrauch im immer politischer werdenden Alltag, wirkten dahin, dass der traditionelle Beiklang und bald auch der Ursprung des Wortes rascher in den Hintergrund traten, als es sonst in wortgeschichtlichen Entwicklungen der Fall ist.

So wurde aus dem Spottnamen *Nazi* innerhalb der Partei, solange sie in der Opposition stand, da und dort ein Trutzname wie einst *les gueux* > *Geusen*, bis schließlich die Machtergreifung und die Gleichsetzung des Nationalsozialismus mit dem Staat solchen Gebrauch für seine Anhänger unnötig und für seine Gegner gefährlich machte. *Nazi* durfte nicht mehr verwendet werden.¹⁵ Wo aber

¹² Provinziell könnte noch eine vierte Assoziationsgruppe mitgespielt haben. *Nazion*, Kurzform *Natz* ist alemannisch "Volk, Leute pejorativ: *Des ist eine böse Natz*, ein schlimmes Volk. *Heut hat er wieder seinen Nationalstolz*, zeigt wieder seine ganze Einbildung, Hochmut." *Schwäb. Wb.*, Nachtrag.

¹³ Es war laut *Schwäbischem Wb.* in seinen pejorativen Anwendungen aus dem angrenzenden katholischen Schwäbischen auch ins Fränkische gedrungen.

¹⁴ Paradoxer Weise war sie in ihren Anfängen selbst mit dem doppeldeutigen *Nazi* belastet worden. In Wilhelm Buschs "allegorischem Zeitbild" *Pater Filucius*, einer politischen Vers-Satire, heißt der international eingestellte Sozialdemokrat, der ebenso wie die katholische Kirche (*Pater Filucius!*) als Feind des deutschen *Michel* vorgeführt wird, *Inter-Nazi*: "Pater Luzi, finster blickend,/ Heimlich schleichend um das Haus/ Wählt zu neuem Rachezwecke/ Zwo verwogene Lumpen aus.—/Einer heißt der Inter-Nazi/ Und der zweite Jean Lecaq/ Alle beide wohl zu brauchen,/ Denn es mangelt Geld im Sack." 2. Aufl. (1873), 29.

¹⁵ Vgl. W. L. Shirer, *Berlin Diary*, 495, Eintragung 2. September 1940.

die Partei verboten blieb, wie in Österreich, da wurde als herausfordernde Geste der Name von den Anhängern gelegentlich weiter gebraucht.¹⁶

Zur Zeit jenes Verbotes war *Nazi* schon längst aus dem bloß deutschen Sprachgebrauch herausgetreten. Die Ausbreitung des Wortes auf verschiedenen Sprachebenen des Englischen z. B. bedürfte einer eigenen, sich weit ins Politische verzweigenden Studie. Die fortschreitende Identifizierung von *Nazi* mit *German*, abhängig vom Grade politischer Bildung und von der Sprechsituation, und die Anwendung des Ausdrucks zur Bezeichnung einer politischen Haltung, losgelöst von spezifisch Deutschem, sind die Hauptmerkmale dieses Prozesses vom Gesichtspunkt des Bedeutungswandels. Er ist grundsätzlich gleich dem von *Bolschewik* im Deutschen und *Red* im Englischen.

II

So wie *Nazi* in den Anfängen seiner parodistischen Anwendung als Abkürzung bereits einen reichen politischen Bedeutungswert hatte, so ist auch sein Modell *Sozi* zuerst mehr als eine Kurzform für *Sozialdemokrat* gewesen. Denn *so grober Sozi*, unter dem Stichwort *Sozi* im Schmeller-Frommannschen Wörterbuch (1872-1877) angeführt, war schon lange eine stehende Wendung gewesen, festgehalten bereits von Schmeller, der 1852 starb. Sie geht auf *Socius*, "grober, roher Mensch"¹⁷ zurück, das im Index zu Schmeller als gleichbedeutend mit *Sozi* behandelt wird. Während *Socius* in dieser Bedeutung zumindest im Österreichisch-Bayrischen des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts weit verbreitet war und in den volkstümlichen Komödien des Zeitraumes häufig belegt ist,¹⁸ konnte

¹⁶ So erschien z. B. "illegal" herausgegeben von der verbotenen Hitlerjugend in Österreich ein *Nazi-Katechismus*. (*New York Times*, Jan. 9th, 1938, 24) Andere Beispiele bei Spitzer, *l. c.*, 264.—Uns scheint es sich in diesen Fällen um das alte polemische Mittel zu handeln, die Sprechweise des Gegners zu verhöhnen (Berühmteste Beispiele die *Epistulae Obscurorum Virorum* und Pascals *Lettres Provinciales*). Ähnlich verwendet das *Schwarze Korps*, Organ der S. S., das verbotene Wort noch jetzt, um die Gegner der Partei zu parodieren: "No one can expect the State to condemn more and more Nazi functionaries just to make the Müllers of Germany happy." (*Inside Germany Reports*, issued by the American Friends of German Freedom, 1942, No. 22, 2.)

¹⁷ Nach F. S. Hügel, *Wörterbuch des Wiener Dialektes*.

¹⁸ Vgl. den Beleg aus Schikaneder aus dem Jahr 1793 in Nestroy, *SW*, IX, 607 (Anhang). Ferner Nestroy, *Eine Wohnung ist zu vermieten* (1837),

ich die Form *Sozi* nur bei Schmeller finden. Als Diminutiv ist es offenbar die spätere Form, und so mag seine Bedeutung "Grobian" im Laufe weniger Jahrzehnte vom politischen Sinn des Wortes aufgesaugt worden sein.¹⁹ Jede Abkürzung von *Sozialdemokrat* mit herabsetzendem Gefühlswert wäre wohl als scherhafte oder satirische Bezeichnung lebensfähig gewesen, aber eine vielfach bewußt zur Schau getragene Eigentümlichkeit in den Umgangsformen der Sozialisten muß den (groben) *Sozi* zur besonders willkommenen doppelsinnigen Bezeichnung gemacht haben: das häufig betont un-"*bourgeoise*," un-"*geschliffene*" Auftreten der Parteianhänger.

Schmeller bemüht sich, die Bedeutungsverschlechterung von *socius* soziologisch oder kulturgeschichtlich zu erklären.²⁰ Obwohl seine zweite Erklärung, aus dem katholischen Kulturkreis abgeleitet, als Stütze das für sich hat, daß *Sozius*, "grober Mensch" nur oberdeutsch belegt ist, glaube ich, daß die Analogie zum Bedeutungsabstieg von Wörtern semantisch ähnlichen Ursprungs wie *Gesell* (*Räuber gesell*, *sonderbarer Gesell*, *was für ein Gesell!*), *Kumpan*, *copain*, *fellow* ihn ausreichend erklärt. Die Vorstellung von den traditionellen *Sozis* ist auch mit betonter proletarischer *Gefährten*-schaft verknüpft, und eine Pikanterie des Sprachgebrauches fügte es, daß sie einander mit einer Übersetzung von *socius* anredeten: *Genosse*.

Das als oberdeutsches Diminutiv-Suffix wirkende *-i* hat dem *Sozi* ebenso wie dem *Nazi* viel von der beabsichtigten Würde der ursprünglich zugrunde liegenden Formen geraubt und wird der Übernahme des Spottwortes im Norden Deutschlands förderlich

I. Akt, 15. Auftritt: "Der grobe Hausmeister CAJETAN. . . . Ös Weibsbilder seids alle unter meiner Würde. LISETTE. Er ist ein *Socius*, mein Freund, Er sollt' sich ein Beispiel nehmen an dem Hausmeister hier im Haus, der hat eine Art." (*Ausgewählte Werke*, hgg. v. Franz H. Mautner, 141).

¹⁹ Die Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei wurde 1869, die Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei 1875 gegründet, das Aufsehen erregende "Sozialistengesetz" war von 1878 bis 1890 wirksam. Um 1900 war *Sozi* im politischen Sinn gang und gäbe.

²⁰ "Etwa von *socius divinorum*, Gesell des Kirchherrn? oder aus der Zeit der Jesuiten, von denen nach den Ordensvorschriften, wo möglich, keiner allein, sondern immer mit einem *Socius* wohnen, reisen, agieren sollte?"

gewesen sein, wo *Socius* als "Grobian" vermutlich unbekannt war. Verstümmelte Kurzformen, welche die bei der Namengebung wirksamen Begriffe nicht mehr erkennen lassen, sind brauchbarere politische Waffen als die offizielle Parteibezeichnung des Gegners. Diese wird oft zu viel Programmatiches enthalten, das für den Angreifenden annehmbar sein könnte: *sozial, demokratisch, national, sozialistisch* in unseren Fällen. "The decrease in the logical content of the word involves an increase in its range of applicability."²¹

FRANZ H. MAUTNER

Hobart and William Smith Colleges

WIENERISCH REMASSURI

Schmeller, *Bayr. Wb. s. v. Remassori, Remassuri* sagt:

(Wien) Ausgelassenheit der Kinder und des Gesindes in Abwesenheit der Eltern. Castelli Wbch. 219: *die Remassori*; Seidl, Flins.[erln] (1839) II, 79. 102: *das Remassuri*, Lärm, Gepolter.

Castelli, *Wörterbuch der Mundart in Österreich unter der Enns* (1847) glossiert (*die*) *Remassori* 'ein lustiger Lärm, z. B. *Mach'ds drausten kan so a Remassori!* griech. $\beta\pi\mu\epsilon\iota\pi$, angels. *hrgman*' [!]. Hügel, *Der Wiener Dialekt* (1873) hat *Remasori* 'wirres Gejohle, lärmende Unterhaltung,' Schranka, *Wiener Dialekt-Lexikon* (1905): *Remasuri* 'eine tolle Geschichte' (mit Beleg aus einem Lied von C. Lorens: *Ist wo a Hetz, a Gaude, Wie ma sagt a laute Remasuri*). Mir persönlich ist nur mehr die *u*-Form geläufig und die Nuance von Lärm kombiniert sich für mein Gefühl mit 'Getu, Geschichtenmachen, Aufhebens.' Ein Wiener Freund definiert: "Ramasuri ist Unordnung, 'Wirtschaft,' z. B.: 'es tut mir so leid, dass ich dich heut nicht zu Tisch einladen kann; aber es ist Wäsche und dann ist immer eine solche Ramasuri zuhaus.' E. Sachs in *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht* 32, 78, die die Fremdwörter im österreichischen Deutsch behandelt,¹ bespricht nicht dieses Fremdwort, teilt mir aber privatim mit, dass für sie der

²¹ E. H. Sturtevant, *Linguistic Change* (1917), 89.

¹ Ich erinnere mich in *Zeitschrift des Ferdinandeaums* eine den Aufsatz E. Sachs' vorwegnehmende, aber mehr katalogisierende Studie von Th. Gartner s. z. gelesen zu haben (mir hier nicht zugänglich).

semantische Kern des Wortes 'Wirrwarr, Patsche, unlösbare Situation' (= engl. *mess*) ist und die normale phonetische Form *Ramassuri*—die offenbar von der Dialektform für 'räumen': *rama* volksetymologisch beeinflusst sein muss.²

Wir haben hier einen Ableger des mittel-lateinischen Juristenwortes *litterae remissoriales* 'quibus de re aliqua inquisitio, examen, vel judicium, ad aliquem remittuntur' (Du Cange), *remissoria* 'judicium, sententia repudiata' (Bartal, *Glossarium ... latinitatis regni Hungariae*),³ span. *remisória* 'despacho con que el juez remite la causa ó el preso á otro tribunal' (Dicc. acad., Dicc. de autoridades), ital. *remissoria* 'patente con cui si rimette ad altrui alcun atto giuridico' (Tomm.-Bell.) ; cf. frz. *lettres remissoriales* 'celles dont le but était de renvoyer, par-devant un juge, l'examen d'une affaire' (Larousse du XX^e s.), *rémission* 'Überweisung eines Prozesses' entsprechend mittellat. *remissio* (Du Cange, s. v. 2), engl. *letter remissory* oder *remissive*, und letztlich *causam ad senatum remitttere* bei Tacitus. Es handelt sich also um einen semantischen Kommentar, mit dem sich das Volk an dem lästigen (ex-) österreichischen Heiligen Bürokratius rächt, die Ursprungssphäre weit hinter sich zurücklassend: die Verweisung eines Streitfalles an einen anderen Gerichtshof wird vor allem als Belästigung, als überflüssiges Getue und Gerede, als 'tolle Geschichte' aufgefasst, und von da geht der Weg unbehindert weiter zu 'Lärm, Ausgelassenheit.' Vgl. die von E. Sachs aufgezählten, in Wien volkstümlich gewordenen Juristenwörter *jem. koram nehmen, ein Nisi* etc. Eine genaue semantische Parallelie in der gemeindeutschen Volkssprache ist *Fisimatenten* 'Flausen, Umstände, Ausflüchte' aus *visae patentes* (*litterae*), "durch spöttische Auffassung des Bürokratischen" erklärt in Kluge-Götze.

Das weibliche Geschlecht, das Castelli betont, ist das des lateinischen *remissoria* [*littera*]. Den *-i*-Ausgang bezeugt E. Sachs reichlich in einheimischen und entlehnten Wörtern des Wienerischen. Man muss bedenken dass hd. *-e*, "wenn es bleibt und nicht durch *r* oder *n* in *a* verwandelt wurde (*glocka* 'Glocken,' *oda* 'oder'), zu einem kurzen *i*" wird, z. B. *a schaini* (schöne);

² Der "Sprach-Brockhaus" (1935) gibt für unser österr. Wort ein mask. Geschlecht an, das mir ungebräuchlich scheint.

³ Cf. zur Ellipse von *litterae* dtsh. *Patent* aus *litterae patentes*, frz. *missive* 'Sendschreiben,' span. *ejecutória* 'Adelsbrief' und *petitória* 'Petition' (mittellat. *petitorium* Du C.) und oben im Text deutsch *Fisimatenten*.

schweichi (Schwäche), *gudi* 'gut' Adverb, *kuaraschi* . . . (Courage), *pumadi* 'Pomade; gleichgültig,' Nagl, *Gramm. Analyse des niederöst. Dial.* (1886), S. 42 u. 199. *Couraschi, Bagaschi, Modi* (bei Seidl), *marodi, Spadi* (it. *spade*) in *Spadifankerl* 'teuflisches Kind' sind also lautgerechte Dialektvarianten von im Hd. eingebürgerten Fremdwörtern (wogegen *Courasch, Bagasch, Blamasch, Mariasch* direkt aus dem Frz. stammen). Hinzukommen nun im Wienerischen *-i*-Formen in Fremdwörtern aus dem Italienischen (*Gschpusi* > *sposi*, *Lazzi, Schani* > *Gianni*) und Lateinischen. Dass auch lateinische Fremdwörter sich mit *-i*-Ausgang begnügen mussten, zeigen *salfaweni* 'mit Erlaubnis' < *salva venia*; 'die kleinen guten *Ordinari*-Seelerln' (Nestroy, *Talisman* II) < *ordinarius*; *Notari* (in Hofmannsthal's "Rosenkavalier"); der Name *Paphnuzi* bei Seidl;⁴ *Negozi* (< *negotium*), *Spezi* = *Spezialfreund*, *Sozi* 'Socius' (in Wien gebraucht vor der allgemein deutschen Einenung aufs Politische). Ob *Zigori, Kumödi, Histori* von hd. *-ie*-Formen (> *ii* > *i*) oder von lateinischen (mit Apokope) stammen, lässt sich wohl nicht sagen (ein *Alleziguri*, das Chiavacci seiner Frau Sopherl vom Naschmarkt als Verballhornung von *Allegorie* in den Mund legt, ist ganz im Sinn dieser Bildungen). Ich habe allerdings den Eindruck dass das *-i* in den Fremdwörtern oder Wörtern, deren Etymologie nicht mehr klar ist (*Gschpusi, Schani*, den Adv. *pomalli* 'langsam,' *lepschi* 'schnell' [aus dem Slav.], *Komödi*, auch in *Stritzi* 'herumstreicher Geck, Zuhälter,' von mundartlich-bayerischem *stritzeln* 'eifertig dahinlaufen'), und auch das diminutive *-i* in *Rudi, Bubi, Mädi, Radi* 'Radieschen' fester im Bewusstsein verankert sind als das *-i* in *schaini, schweichi, gudi* (= schöne, schwäche, gute), dem stets die mehr hochsprachliche *-e*-Variante zur Seite steht: die Mundartdichter die *Kumödi* schreiben, können sich der *schaini*-Form enthalten.⁵ Auf diese

⁴ Vgl. noch bei diesem die Redensart *in ana Glori und Viktori*, in dem angehängten Wörterbuch übersetzt 'in vollster Wonne und Lust.' *Remassuri* selbst habe ich bei Seidl nicht finden können.

⁵ Ich sage z. B. *die Gaudee* für 'eine Hetz,' was offenbar eine hyperkorrekte Bildung für volkstümlicheres *die Gaudi* (< lat. *gaudium*, offenbar urspr. Studentenwort) ist, zum Feminin gemacht wegen des *-i* der Femininabstrakta wie *schweichi*,—"dieser Regel zulieb," wie Nagl sagt. Schranka schreibt *Gaudé*, mit einer französischen Orthographie, die einer sekundären 'französischen' Aussprache entspricht und die Entwurzelung des Wortes gut ausdrückt (cf. die Eigennamen *Rosé, Franqué* aus *Róse Fránke*); vielleicht ist auch *Faschee* 'Verdruss' (< frz. *être fâché*) vom Einfluss gewesen—allerdings ist dies maskulin.

Weise kommt das *-i*- (wenigstens das 'feste' *-i*) zur Funktion einer Art gemeinsamen Nenners der Fremdwörter (und der irgendwie fremd anmutenden Wörter wie *Strizzi*).

Man könnte annehmen, dass das Suffix von (*die*) *Remassuri* (mit *u*- aus *-ô*- wie in *Uhr* < *hôra*, frühnhd. *ure* und *ore*, wienerisch *Jux* = lat. *jocus*, *Schuttentur* volkstümliche Aussprache der Wiener Strassenbezeichnung *Schottentor*) produktiv geworden ist in wien. (*die*) *Kramuri* 'Mischmasch verschiedener unbedeutender und abgenützter Gegenstände, lästige Trödelware,' eine hybride Bildung von dem einheimischen *Kram* mittels eines Fremdwortsuffixes (vgl. gemeindeutsche Fälle wie *Glasur*, *Sammelsurium* [> deutschem *sammelsûr*, Kluge-Götze], und *Brimborium*, *Lappalie* etc.), die noch ausserdem an lat. Kollektive wie *centuria*, *decuria* anknüpfen kann. *Remassuri* hat denn sein feminines Geschlecht und seine Bedeutung 'überflüssiges (Getu und Gerede)' an ein *Kramuri* weitergegeben, das die Sprachgemeinschaft halbbekannt anmuten musste: als eine Weiterbildung von *Kram* mit einem spielerisch-phantastischen gelehrten Anhängsel, das nun so recht geeignet schien, Belästigung auszudrücken—die Belästigung, die der volkstümliche Sprecher in gelehrten Wörtern fühlt, die sich seinem Verständnis nicht unmittelbar erschliessen (cf. die Wucherung derselben gelehrten Endung *-orio*, *-ori* in span., portug. und ital. Mundarten, vgl. Verf., *Rev. de fil. esp.* IX, 390). Max Mayer, *Das Wienerische* (1924) fasst *Gramuri* [sic!], trotz der Ableitung von *Kram*, als Lautnachahmung—and das ist sicher das naive Gefühl jedes Wieners auch angesichts *Remassuri*. Dr. Franz Mautner schreibt mir, über sein 'naives Empfinden' über *Remassuri* befragt: "dass die Endung *-uri* den Wirrwarr, das Ungeordnete bezeichnet und *remas-* den Lärm . . . Vier verschiedene Vokale in vier Silben, zwei davon starktonig, das gibt schon eine gehörige Klangfülle." Wissenschaftlich betrachtet, handelt es sich um sekundäre Onomatopoesis, um 'Umempfindung' einer Endung ins Klanghafte, die ursprünglich nichts mit Klang (*remiss-oria!*) und eher mit dem Gefühl der 'Befremdung,' die mit jedem Fremdbestandteil eines Sprachsystems verbunden ist, zu tun hatte. Mit dem 'fremdartigen' und 'lärmenden' Eindruck, den dies *-uri* macht, spielt offenbar auch die in Wien kursierende Erzählung, die Schranka s. v. *rama* 'räumen' aufführt: "Der Arbeiter [ich kenne die Geschichte als von einem Pflasterer erzählt, der einem Fremden Auskunft gibt] antwortet auf die Frage, was er da tue: *Rama tur i*, mehrere: *Rama ta ma* und, mit Bezug auf

andere: *Rama tan s.'*” Ein *ramaturi* ‘räumen tu ich’ (mit dem -r-, das ein Überbleibsel des o im mhd. Diphthong *uo* ist) macht den Eindruck eines Fremdwortes⁶ (vielleicht gerade eines vom Schlage unseres *Remassuri Ramassuri*, das selbst, s. oben, unter den Einfluss von *rama* geraten ist), und die humoristische Sprachbeobachtung der mundartlichen Rede freut sich an dem ‘echtwienerischen’ Wortungeheuer, das dem Fremden unbezwingbar scheinen muss: eine Art linguistische Selbstbespiegelung und Betrachtung der eigenen Mundart ‘wie von aussen,’ die gerade durch deren Fremdwortbestände geweckt wird und zu dem auch sonst reflektierten und nüancierten, richtig ‘barocken’ Verhältnis des Österreichers zur Sprache stimmt: der geographischen Vielfalt des alten Österreich entspricht ein vielschichtiges Erleben der Sprache in der ‘österreichischen Seele.’

LEO SPITZER

CHRISTINAS HEIMREISE UND IHR VORBILD

Es ist bekannt, daß der Vorfall, der Hofmannsthals Komödie als Thema dient, in den Erinnerungen Casanovas berichtet wird.¹ Jahre vorher, im *Abenteurer und die Sängerin*, hat Hofmannsthal den aus den Bleikammern entronnenen, sich wieder nach Venedig wagenden Abenteurer gestaltet und den von keiner Liebe gewandelten einer sich bewahrenden und starken Frau gegenübergestellt. Ein anderes Porträt Casanovas, des Jünglings auf der Höhe der Lebenskraft, ist in *Florindo und die Unbekannte* festgehalten. Schließlich hatte sich der Dichter in *Silvia im Stern* an der szenischen Situation versucht, die er in *Christinas Heimreise* verwendet, dem Vorsaal des Gastrofs mit den Zimmertüren.² Alle diese Versuche zusammenfassend, wollte Hofmannsthal in *Christinas Heimreise* ein Lebensbild Casanovas gestalten. Der Heimfahrt des in der Heiratshoffnung

⁶ Dieser Umstand wird auch wohl z. T. erklären, warum Italienisch dem Wiener so viel komischer dünkt als etwa Französisch: die -i- Endungen jener Sprache erinnern ihn an seine eigenen Volkswörter auf -i.—Man vergleiche mit der Einreihung der Fremdwörter in ein Einheitsschema -i etwa den -s- Plural der Fremdwörter im Norddeutschen.

¹ In der *Édition originale, la seule complète*, Bruxelles, 1887: Ende des ersten und Anfang des zweiten Bandes.

² Die ihm, ausser von Lessing vertraut, vielleicht in Moratin's *El sú de las niñas* aufgefallen war.

enttäuschten reichen Bauernmädchen und ihrer Verführung in wenigen Stunden mußte ein Umriß des nie zögernden, immer glücklichen, sich verschwendenden Florindo vorausgehen, mit der für den wirklichen Casanova so bezeichnenden Beziehung zu zwei Schwestern. Aber wie sollte das Stück enden? Der *Charles* der Memoiren, den Casanova dem Mädchen für die versprochene Ehe besorgt und statt seiner eigenen unwürdigen Person annehmbar macht, identifizierte sich für den Dichter mit dem von Casanova immer Betrogenen, dem den ein starkes inneres Leben schwer und zurückhaltend macht. In der ersten Fassung von *Christinas Heimreise* (1910) kehrt diese Gestalt, der Kapitän, das ganze Stück um: seine tiefwurzelnde Stärke und Beständigkeit stellt den sich verflatternden, immer gleichen Florindo in den Schatten, ähnlich wie Vittoria den Abenteurer überragt. Aber damit wird aus einer Komödie ein schwerfälliges moralisches Stück,³ und Hofmannsthal, der dies selbst merkte, hat den letzten Akt nie wieder drucken lassen, nur mit einer Andeutung geschlossen, die uns die Wertlosigkeit des immer neuen und immer gleichen Suchens Florindos ahnen läßt. Die Umkehrung der ersten Fassung von einer Komödie in ein moralisches Charakterstück, die Rollenvertauschung zwischen dem Kapitän und Florindo, von denen der eine in den Vordergrund tritt, während der andere verschwindet, beruht auf zwei Ursachen. Einmal fühlte der Dichter beide Charaktere in seinem eigenen Wesen: der Gegensatz zwischen dem sich ans Leben Verschwendenden, der jedem Augenblick und jeder Welle folgt, und dem in sich Gebundenen, als wäre er unfähig zum Leben, geht durch sein ganzes Werk,⁴ und Hofmannsthal wußte, welchem er sein wahreres Leben verdankte. Aber, zweitens, verlangt auch das Lebensbild Casanovas, wenn *Christinas Heimreise* als solches geplant war, ein Gegengewicht. Jeder Leser der Erinnerungen Casanovas ist hingezissen von dem Schauspiel des Lebens, von der wunderbaren Lebenskraft die sich hier verströmt, er denkt notwendig an Goethe als an ein Bild ähnlicher elementarer Stärke, das uns in gleicher Deutlichkeit vor Augen steht. Aber nach einiger Zeit, wenn alles nur an der Oberfläche bleibt, sich wie Schaum verflüchtigt, und der

³ Richard Alewyn, "Hofmannsthals erste Komödie," im *Jahrbuch des freien deutschen Hochstifts*, Frankfurt a. Main, 1934/5, ist anderer Meinung.

⁴ Sie vereinigen sich im *Schwierigen*, dem, sozusagen, unfreiwilligen Abenteurer, unter der eigenen Maske des Dichters.

Held in der niedrigsten Leere sein Genügen findet, ohne den geringsten Gewinn, beginnt der Leser doch zu zweifeln an dem Wert einer solchen Kraft, die keine Stille kennt und nichts in sich aufzubauen vermag. Auf diese Weise wird der letzte Akt der ersten Fassung von *Christinas Heimreise* mehr gefordert durch die Lektüre und das Lebensbild Casanovas als durch die eigenen Gesetze der Komödie.

WALTER NAUMANN

University of Michigan

TWO OLD ENGLISH WORDS

1. Old Anglian (*ge*)*strynd*.

According to all recent dictionaries OE. (*ge*)*strynd*, fem., meaning 'lineage,' 'line of inheritance,' 'generation,' 'race,' 'tribe,' has an originally long vowel and is connected with *gestrienan*, *gestrēnan*, 'gain,' 'acquire,' 'beget.' Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement* (1921) lists two different meanings and two forms (*gestrēonde*, *gestrynd*) under *gestrīnd*, a form never actually recorded, and connects with *gestrēonan*, thus following the practise of the main dictionary, s. v. *strīnd*. The *NED*. in 1919, following Bosworth-Toller, derived *strīnd* from "OE. (Anglian), *strīnd*, also *gestrēond*, *gistrīnd*, from (*ge*)*strienan*, 'to produce, beget.'" Clark Hall has *strīnd* (= īe) in the third edition of his *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (1931). Holthausen (*Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1931) follows his usual practise of listing the word under its supposed Early West Saxon form *gestrīend*, a form not recorded for either of his definitions 'Gewinn; Nachkommenschaft.' On the other hand, the vowel of (*ge*)*strynd* was considered short by Sweet in his *Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (1896) and thus presumably dissociated from *gestrienan*, and it has likewise been considered short by such students of dialect as Cook, Jordan, and Stolz.¹ The dialectologists are, I believe, right; but whether the *y*

¹ A. S. Cook, *Glossary to the Old Northumbrian Gospels* (Halle, 1894), s. v. *strynd*; R. Jordan, *Eigentümlichkeiten des englischen Wortschatzes* (Heidelberg, 1906), p. 63; W. Stolz, *Der Vokalismus . . . der Lindisfarner Evangelien* (Bonn, 1908), p. 54; cf. S. T. R. O. d'Ardenne, *An Edition of þe Liflade ant te Passioun of Seinte Iuliene* (Paris, 1936), who correctly derives *strīnd* from OE. *strynd*.

is short or long, it is plain that the lexicographers could not have connected the word with *gestriēnan*, by equating the *y* of (*ge*)*strynd* with WS. *ie*, if they had duly considered the fact that the word is limited to the Anglian dialect.

Strynd is cited from five texts in Old English by Bosworth-Toller, usually as a gloss of Latin *tribus* or *stirps*. It occurs five times in the Old English translation of Bede, considered originally Mercian,² twice in the Lindisfarne gospels, the second instance duly copied by Owun in the Rushworth gospels (Matt. 19, 28; Luke 22, 30); once glossing *tribus* in the *Durham Ritual*,³ where *soð gestrynd* also appears glossing *progeniem*, this being the only instance of the word with the prefix *ge-* recorded by the dictionaries; and once in the *Blickling Homilies*,⁴ the vocabulary of which shows them to have been originally composed in Anglian.⁵ The only occurrence of the word in the poetry is in the compound *eormenstrynd*, *Solomon and Saturn* 322, where I mistakenly marked the vowel long in my recent edition. So far as I know, the *y* is not marked long in any of the MSS of these texts; but even if it were, this would not determine the length of the original vowel, since the recorded instances are all late enough to have undergone the ninth-century lengthening of vowels before *-nd*.

Because of its appearance in the Anglian texts listed above and its absence from West Saxon texts *strynd* has long been recognized as an Anglian word.⁶ Since *strynd* occurs only in Anglian and is spelled consistently with *y*, the vowel must be i-umlauted *ȳ* < *ū*ⁱ that is 'stable' *y*, long or short. Only a LWS. *strynd*-spelling could have *ȳ* < *ie* < *iu*ⁱ, as in *gestrȳnan* 'to gain' **gestriēnan* < **gestriūjan* beside *gestrēonan* < *gestrōnan* (unumlauted); but the Anglian

² The instances, cited by Deutschbein *PBB*. xxvi (1901), 172, are in I, 15 (p. 52, l. 14 ed. Miller, p. 42 ed. Schipper); III, 14 (p. 194, l. 6 ed. Miller, p. 253 ed. Schipper); IV, 22 (p. 328 l. 17 ed. Miller; p. 458 ed. Schipper); V, 7 (p. 406, l. 10 ed. Miller; p. 585 ed. Schipper); V, 19 (p. 452, l. 29 ed. Miller, p. 658 ed. Schipper).

³ Pp. 193, 29, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson and U. Lindelöf (1927), *Surtees Society* 140.

⁴ P. 23, l. 28, ed. R. Morris.

⁵ Günther Scherer, *Zur Geographie u. Chronologie des ags. Wortschatzes* (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 42-43.

⁶ Sweet, *Student's Dictionary*, 'not W'; Deutschbein *PBB*. xxvi, 172; Jordan, *Eigentümlichkeiten*, p. 63.

forms corresponding to LWS. **strýnd* would be Nth. **stríond*, M. **stréond*, not *strýnd*, since *(ge)stríona(n)* (Lindisfarne and Rushworth II) corresponds to LWS. *(ge)strienan*, *(ge)strýnan*;⁷ Holthausen, if he had cited the only correct form, Angl. *(ge)strynd*, instead of an invented WS. *gestriend*, could not have compared OHG. *gistríunida*, 'officium,' 'lucrum,' to which the normal correspondent in Old English would be *gestríenþ(u)*.⁸ One might, of course, indulge in reconstructions in order to relate *strýnd* or *strynd* ultimately with *stréon* and *gestrienan*, which Walde-Pokorny (II, 640) and the *NED*. trace to IE. **streu* and connect with Lat. *struo*, *strues*. Thus *strynd* presumably from **strunðiz* might be considered an extension of a Germanic weak grade **strun* beside e-grade **streun*; but this is hardly justifiable unless there are other compelling reasons. An examination of the Old English material seems to indicate that *strynd* has been unnecessarily forced into relation with *stréon*, *strienan*, and that, although the words came to be popularly associated through convergence of meaning, there is no reason to connect them historically or etymologically.

Do Old English forms with a d-suffix, that is *gestréond*, *gestrýnd* or *gestriend*, ever mean 'gain,' and do *(ge)stréon*-forms, without -d, ever mean 'lineage'? Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement*, s. v. *gestrínd*, cites from Wright-Wülker a form *gestréonde* for the first sense 'gain' (the second sense being 'progeny'); Clark Hall cites the same passage under *strýnd*; and Holthausen, s. v. *gestriend*, gives the meaning 'Gewinn'; but the sole evidence for this meaning in Old English is the gloss in Cotton Cleopatra A III of *questu* as 'gestreonde.'⁹ This is not trustworthy evidence for a word *gestréond* 'gain,' since it might be a form of the past participle (inst. sing. ? nom. acc. pl. ?), but is more likely to be an error for *gestréone* in this orthographically not very dependable manuscript. In the corresponding Aldhelm gloss in Royal 5 E XI, *questu* is glossed *gestréo*, which Napier assumes to be an error for *gestréon*.¹⁰ Middle

⁷ On the phonology cf. Luick, *Historische Grammatik* §§ 191.2; the infinitive *stríona(n)* actually does not occur in the Northumbrian gospels, but for numerous verbal forms in *io* see Cook, *Glossary*, who lists them under *(ge)stríoniga*, mistakenly making them all wk. 2 verbs.

⁸ J. Wright, *Old English Grammar*, 3rd ed. §§ 371, 613. Holthausen has of course, followed Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement*, in coalescing two different words into one.

⁹ Wright-Wülker, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, I, 488, l. 30.

¹⁰ A. Napier, *Old English Glosses*, p. 165, l. 69.

English forms in *-d* (*strind*, *strund*), derived from *strynd*, never mean 'gain,' but always 'line,' 'lineage,' 'race.'

Conversely, (*ge*)*strēond*, though it meant 'begetting' as well as 'gain' in Old English, never meant 'lineage' until Middle English times. Scholars have been naturally misled into trying to connect *strynd* 'lineage' with WS. (*ge*)*strȳnan*, verb, and OE. (*ge*)*strēon*, noun, because one sense of *gestrȳnan* is 'beget,' 'procreate,' *gestrēon* correspondingly meaning 'begetting,' 'procreation.' This leads in the Middle English *strene*, noun (Mod. Engl. *strain*) to the meanings 'lineage,' 'race,' 'stock,' almost exactly corresponding to those of OE. *strynd*. Nevertheless, the Old English material points to the fact that, as Bosworth-Toller and the *NED*. assume, the primary sense of *strienan* was to 'gain' 'acquire,' and that of *gestrienan* to 'acquire by effort,' the meaning 'beget' being secondary. One may compare the semantic development of *beget* itself. In the case of the noun *gestrēon*, the meanings 'gain,' 'treasure,' 'profit,' 'lucrum,' 'emolumentum,' are the earlier and commoner; cf. OHG., OS. *gistruni*, 'treasure,' 'lucrum.'¹¹ There is only one bit of evidence, so far as I know, that *gestrēon* could mean 'lineage,' 'stock' in Old English and that is the appearance of the word in MS B (Corpus Christi College Cambridge 41) of the Old English version of Bede (iv, 22). Here, where the Trinity, Cambridge University, and Cotton Otho 13 xi MSS have *strynd* (*he wæs-æpelre strynde*: erat de nobilibus), MS B has *he wæs æpeles gestreones*. This is an error for original *strynd*, since the scribe of B does not know the Anglian word *strynd* and substitutes *cynn* or *gebyrd* in all other instances; but it shows how easily *gestrēon*, 'begetting' could be equated with *strynd* 'lineage.' In Middle English times the two words are used in alliteration in the prose *Juliana*—*streon of swich a strund*, 'descendant of such a race';¹² and in Layamon's *Brut* (*i*)*streon* is used regularly in the sense of 'lineage,' 'line,' *streone* being actually substituted by the scribe of MS B for A's *strund* in 2736. It should be noted that the Middle English forms of *strynd*, normally *strind* in the North and *strund* in the West Midland, the word not being recorded for the South,

¹¹ If the connection with Latin *strues*, and Jordanes' *strava* are correct, as is commonly assumed (cf. Holthausen, s. v. *strēon*), the semantic development would have to be 'heap up,' 'acquire.'

¹² Ed. S. T. R. O. d'Ardenne, p. 429, l. 529.

corroborate the assumption of an OE. (Anglian) *strynd* with i-umlauted *y* from *u*.¹³

The chief purpose of this note is to show that OE. *strynd* must be divorced etymologically from *strēon*, *strienan*. If the word seems now to be left unhappily isolated, I may suggest that a more likely relation would be with Scandinavian *strind* and Germanic *strand* which P. Persson traced back to Pre-Germanic *strent-*, *strant-*, an extension of the base **ster* 'to stretch.' OE. *strynd* from earlier **strunðiz* could go back to a corresponding weak-grade *strnt-*.¹⁴ It is a striking parallel that Greek *στρατός*, which originally meant 'clan' 'subdivision of the people,' 'group,' 'crowd of people,' has been traced to **strntós*.¹⁵ This reconstruction has been doubted because of the parallel Aeolic *στρότός*,¹⁶ which would seem to show original **strtós*, in which case the connection with *strynd* would be more remote, both being derived from weak-grade but different extensions of the base **ster*. But it is certainly noteworthy that so many derivatives of extensions of the base **ster* develop meanings such as 'group,' 'series,' 'clan,' which would be close parallels to *strynd*, 'lineage,' 'tribe.' Persson pointed out that Norw. dial. *strind* means 'Streifen, langes, abgespaltetes Stück, Seite, Hälfte . . . Linie, langer Streifen (z. B. in Zeug), Reihe . . . Schar von Walfischen oder grossen Fischen,'¹⁷ and believed that Scandinavian, English, and German *strand*, 'stretch of land,' 'coast line,' represented the *o*-grade of the same base.¹⁸ With *strind* and *strand* he connected, following Windisch, Middle-Irish *trét* 'herd' < **(s)trento-*, and OBulg. *tratū* 'agmen' < **(s)tronto-*.¹⁹ Besides these related words he adduced many other semantic parallels

¹³ Two unusual forms do appear in the North: *strend* in the Northern Early English Psalter IX, 27 (C. Horstmann, *Yorkshire Writers II*, 142) and *strand* in Cursor Mundi, 9497, 10157, both being used in rhyme. The first might, of course, be derived from an OE. **strēond*, but is probably a late confusion of *strene* and *strind*. *Strand* is listed as a separate word in *NED.*, which suggests that it is an altered form of *strind*.

¹⁴ *Beiträge zur Idg. Wortforschung. Skrifter utgivna af kungl. humanistika Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala X* (Uppsala, 1912), 447-454.

¹⁵ F. Solmsen, *Glotta I* (1909), 78-79; Walde-Pokorny II, 638.

¹⁶ S. Solmsen, p. 79, note 1; Persson, *Beiträge*, p. 451; Walde-Pokorny II, 638. But the Aeolic form might well be secondary.

¹⁷ *Beiträge*, p. 447.

¹⁸ An etymology accepted by Hellqvist, *Svensk etymologisk Ordbok*, and Walde-Pokorny II, 638.

¹⁹ *Beiträge*, p. 448.

in words meaning 'long series' 'line' and 'group.' If OE. *strynd* were traced to IE. weak grade **stryntis* the primary Old English meanings 'line of inheritance,' 'progeny,' 'tribe' would be easily explained as natural developments of the sense 'series,' 'long line' applied to people.

2. OE. *gullisc*.

OE. *gullisc* occurs only once in a late prose text, the *Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn* in Corpus Christi College Cambridge 422, a manuscript dated in the late tenth century.²⁰ It modifies the word *seolfor* 'silver,' but the passage in which it occurs, a fantastic description of the strength and beauty of the Pater Noster, throws little light on its meaning, since the author merely says that the Pater Noster's arms are longer than the earth and its trees even though they should be joined together and gloriously adorned:— 'and ānra gehwylc ende [of the *bēamas* 'trees'] sīe fram ōðrum tō ðām midle mid ðy gulliscan seolfre oferworht and mid ðām neorxnawanges compgimmum āstēned.'²¹ Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement*, simply lists *gullisc* with a question-mark; Clark Hall in his third edition has '? (an attribute of silver)'; and Holthausen similarly writes '(vom Silber?)' with neither definition nor etymology.

Kemble in his edition of the dialogue translated ðy *gulliscan seolfre* 'gilded silver,' and I believe he was right.²² If the phrase is not actually a rendering of the medieval *argentum deauratum* of the goldsmiths, it must at least refer to a kind of silver of a golden color. The form *gullisc* must be derived from OWSc. *gull* 'gold' with the addition of the native ending *-isc*. *ll* for native *ld* is a test of Scandinavian loan-words, and *gull-* therefore stands to native *gold* as ME. *will* (OWSc. *villr*) to native *wild*.²³ There is no corresponding OWSc. **gullskr*, but the Old English might be a modification of the OWSc. *gulligr*.²⁴

The prose dialogue, like the poetical dialogues in the same MS,

²⁰ See my edition of *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, MLA. Monograph Series XIII (New York 1941), p. 1.

²¹ *Poetical Dialogues*, pp. 169-70.

²² J. M. Kemble, *The Dialogue of Salomon and Saturnus* (London, 1848), p. 151.

²³ Cf. Björkman, *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English* (Halle, 1900), 169-170.

²⁴ Recorded from four sources by Cleasby-Vigfusson, *Icelandic-English Dictionary*, and J. Fritzner, *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog*.

was originally Anglian,²⁵ so that Scandinavian influence is quite possible. It might be thought curious that such a word should be derived from Scandinavian when perfectly good English words existed such as *gylden*, adj. 'golden,' 'gilt,' or the past participle of verbs such as *gyldan*, *begyldan*, *ofergyldan*, 'to gild.' Ælfric, for example, translates 'in vestitu deaurato' *on ofergyldum gyrlan*.²⁶ But doublets are fairly common, and in this particular case it may be that in Scandinavian England the word was associated with and reinforced by an OE. **gul(l)* which became ME. *gull* 'yellow, pale,' known to have been borrowed from OWS. *gulr*, and recorded from the thirteenth century on.²⁷ It is not likely, however, that the word was really interpreted as 'yellowish,' since the *-isc* ending in Old English is added only to nouns, is comparatively uncommon except when attached to names of lands and people, and does not appear with adjectives of color until around 1400.²⁸ Furthermore, the use of *deauratum* (which became Fr. *doré*) with *argentum* in medieval documents to mean gilded silver seems to show that the origin must be sought in OWS. *gull* 'gold.'²⁹ OE. *gullisc*, preserved by chance in an originally Anglian document, is something of a curiosity because it adds to the small number of borrowings from Scandinavians recorded before 1000, most of which have to do with the sea or legal matters.³⁰

Yale University

ROBERT J. MENNER

²⁵ *Poetical Dialogues*, pp. 18-21, and p. 20, note 17.

²⁶ *Cath. Hom.* II, 586.

²⁷ Björkman, pp. 212, and *NED*. s. v. *gull*, adj. obs. Cf. also *gulsoght* 'jaundice' (OSwed. *gulasót*) and *gulness* 'yellowness' (Björkman pp. 176, 212).

²⁸ H. Koziol, *Handbuch der englischen Wortbildungsllehre* (Heidelberg, 1937), pp. 172-173 and *NED*. s. v. *-ish*.

²⁹ J. Texier, *Dictionnaire d'Orfèvrerie*, Migne, *Troisième Encyclopédie Théologique* 27 (Paris, 1857), cols. 174-175, says that a silver vessel might be either *totus deauratus* or *partim deauratus*, the former corresponding to what is called in French *argent (en) verré*. He cites from the 1295 *Inventory of St. Paul's* 'calix argenteus per partes deauratus' (W. Dugdale, *Monasticum Anglicanum* III, 327 ed. 1673). A glance at the pages of this famous inventory of St. Paul's shows many entries of silver vessels thus gilded: see especially Dugdale, III, 311-313, 328-330. *Deauratus* is a common word in medieval Latin; see Du Cange and also J. H. Baxter and Charles Johnson, *Medieval Latin Word-List*, Oxford, 1934.

³⁰ M. S. Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English* (London, 1935), p. 64, ascribes about thirty loan-words to the period before 1016.

ON FÆDER FEORME, BEOWULF, LINE 21

It is suggested that one read *feorme* instead of *bearme*¹ in *Beowulf* 21, as the meaning of the alliterative *feorm* would fit the context very well. The meaning of *feorm* is in legal texts 'Beköstigung, Naturalienabgabe; Bodenzins in Naturalien; Schmaus; Bearbeitung des Bodens,'² in poetic documents 'Gastmahl; victus; Bewirtung; Hab and Gut; usus, fructus'³ and in non-legal prose texts 'food, provisions, stores; a feast, entertainment; use, benefit, profit'⁴; *feormian* is translated by 'beköstigen; beherbergen; dem Gutsherrn Gastung leisten; zu Schutz annehmen; als Vasallen annehmen; unterstützen'⁵ etc.

In looking over the passages containing *feorm*, *feormung*, *feormian* etc., one finds that these words are not only associated with goods and possession, with hospitality and entertainment, with dues and rights (*gytefeorm*, *nihtfeorm*, *feormfultum*), but also with support, protection and shelter given to a man who is looking for another lord (Alfred 37: *tó men feormian*) as well as to a fugitive and banished man⁶ (see *flíemanfeorm*, *flíemanfeormung*; *wrecena feormung*, Alfred 4).

Substituting *feorm* for *bearm*, the passage *Beowulf* 20 ff. would read:

Swá sceal (geong g)uma góde gewyrcan
fromum feohgiftum on fæder feorme
þæt hine cn ylde eft gewunigen
wilgesfðas þonne wíg cume,
léode gelæsten.

Gewyrcan may be connected with *feorm* in the same way as *wyrcan* or *(ge)gierwan* in the following sentences: *man þære sunnan feorme worhte*, Hml. Th. II 494, 6: *ðonne ðu feorme gierwe on ælmessan*, Past. 232, 22; *he gegearwode micle feorme*, Mk. 6, 21. Whereas *feohgiftum* and *feorm* reminds one of the ancient formula

¹ For the various interpretations of this passage see J. Hoops, *Kommentar zum Beowulf*, Heidelberg, 1932, p. 9 ff.

² Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, II, 69.

³ Grein-Köhler, *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*, 190 f.

⁴ Bosworth-Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary*, p. 280, and Supplement, p. 213.

⁵ *he ðær (f) or feorme feorhwunde hleat sweordes swengum, sunu Hygelaces*, Be. 2385.

'mid feo and feorme,' 'feoh oððe feorm' (*gewiton him ða eastan æhta lðan, feoh ond feorme*, Gen. 1650; *ðu sweltan scealt mid feo ond mid feorme*, Gen. 2659; *oððe feo oððe feorme*, II Cn 16, A), the association of *feoh* and *feorm* is rather loose in *Beowulf* 21; the accusative *feorme* is here linked with the verb *gewyrcan*.⁶

This interpretation of the construction of the sentence Be. 20 ff., which differs from that generally accepted, also necessitates a different explanation of the construction of *on fader*. In the two passages *gif man cuman feormæð III. niht an his agenum hame*, Ll. Th. 1 32, 16 and *butan ðæs biscopes leafe, ðe hi on his scirø gefeormade sin*, Bd. 4, 5; S. 573, 5 the preposition *on* apparently has a local meaning; but also *on* is used with the person from whom something is taken away;⁷ *on fader*, accordingly, may be rendered by the expression 'from the possessions of his father, through the means of his father.'

That a child may make use of the property of the father to make gifts, is borne out by a passage of the *Edda*. Gerd, the daughter of Gymir, in refusing a ring, gives as a reason that she does not lack any gold in the home of Gymir, as she can distribute the money (the possessions) of her father: *era mer gullz vant i gørðum Gymis, at deila fe fóður*, For Skirnis, 22.

The translation of *Beowulf*, line 20 ff. would then run as follows: Thus shall a young warrior practice hospitality (protection and munificence) through good deeds, through splendid gifts from his father's (possessions), so that. . . .

FRITZ MEZGER

Bryn Mawr College

STANZA CONTINUITY IN THE FAERIE QUEENE

In the stability of its architectural framework the Spenserian stanza presents a difficult technical problem, that of maintaining (and regulating the speed of) continuity. Spenser, it is apparent, was acutely conscious of the problem. Professor Tucker Brooke¹

⁶ For the construction of *gewyrcan* with the accusative, see Grein-Köhler, p. 842 f.

⁷ See Wülfing, *Syntax* II, 503, and Grein-Köhler, *on 'von' bei den Verben nehmen, empfangen*, p. 526.

¹ "Stanza-Connection in the *Fairy Queen*," *M. L. N.*, XXXVII (1922), 223-27.

has pointed out how frequently he employs the device of repeating or varying, in the first line of a stanza, words and phrases of the preceding alexandrine. But this artifice, though pleasing to the ear, is too transparent for frequent use. Indeed, Spenser apparently tires of it in the later books. Throughout the poem, however, Spenser makes conscious and repeated use of less formal rhetorical devices for transition. The first phrase in the first line of hundreds of stanzas looks back, often awkwardly, to what has just preceded.² These workaday expressions,³ as useful in poetry as in prose, are readily detectable; but they are only the external manifestation of an art which is both elaborate and subtle, an art which employs techniques available only in poetry.

Scores of stanzas are linked together by the musical devices of poetry. In large sections of *The Faerie Queene* a single mood is maintained by repeating the same sounds in a carefully controlled orchestration. Frequently the same rime, with elaborate but well-concealed deliberateness, echoes and re-echoes through successive stanzas.⁴ The most sustained example I have noted is the opening of II, iv, where in the first ten stanzas the rimes are intricately woven together. The first and second stanzas have the same "a" rime. In the second stanza, "b" is the same as "b" of the seventh and "a" of the tenth. The "a" of the third stanza is "b" of the fourth and sixth, "c" of the eighth. The fourth and fifth stanzas have the same "a" rime. "C" of the fifth stanza is the same as "a" of the seventh and tenth. The eighth and tenth stanzas have the same "b" rime.

The rimes that echo and re-echo from one stanza to another help maintain a musical continuity.⁵ But Spenser does not rely on this

² A sustained series, by no means unusual, occurs in vi, xi, 3-16.

³ It has been recently pointed out by V. L. Rubel, *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance* (New York, 1941), p. 254, that Spenser makes "extensive use" of rhetorical figures to link stanzas. The importance of this observation would perhaps be clearer if illustration and analysis had been provided.

⁴ Professor Brooke notes this one non-rhetorical device, but apparently does not think it important. He lists only three examples in which a rime is repeated in a single following stanza.

⁵ I have not tried to draw up an exhaustive list. Here are a few examples taken at random: II, iv, 15-16, 19-20, 29-30, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46; II, v, 22, 23, 25, 26; II, xi, 14-15, 16-18, 24-25, 27-29, 43-44, 46-47; II, xii, 2-4, 33-34, 46-48, 49-50, 54-55, 59-60, 74-76; III, xii, 5-6, 7-8, 19-20; IV, ii, 45-46; IV,

device alone. Rimes are only one kind of structural sound. For instance, frequently even the passage of several intervening stanzas will not prevent a repeated rime from echoing. For Spenser often keeps a sound by repeating it in the unrimed places of a stanza or by approximating it, through assonance, in either rimed or unrimed places.⁶ He can also skilfully link stanzas together by means of alliteration:

Sterne was their looke, like wild amazed steares,
Staring with hollow eies, and stiffe upstanding heares.

Fiersly at first those knights they did assayle,
And drove them to recoil: but, when againe
They gave fresh charge, their forces gan to fayle,
Unnable their encounter to sustaine;
For with such puissaunce and impetuous maine
Those champions broke on them, that forst them fly,
Like scattered sheepe, whenas the shepherds swaine
A lyon and a tigre doth espye,
With greedy pace forth rushing from the forest nye.

A while they fled, but soone retourned againe
With greater fury then before was fownd . . .⁷

Because of the strength of its metrical position, the *ff* of "stiffe" has enough vibration to continue being a potentially live sound in the next line. When the responsive vibrations meet they gather force, and are able to continue for a longer interval as a live sound.

We come now to Spenser's technique of using rhythm, narrative and metrical, for controlling stanza continuity. The narrative rhythm hardly requires analysis. It is plain enough that the degree of our interest in the story, or in special events, or special embellishments, will help control the tempo of our turning from one stanza to the next. It is amusing, and significant, that Spenser himself

iii, 1-2; iv, v, 34-35; iv, vi, 20-21, 22-23, 28-29, 35-37; vi, vii, 29-31; viii, xii, 45-46, 47-50.

⁶ For example in II, vi, 14 the "b" rime, "vayn" is the same as the "b" rime of stanza 17. From stanza 11 to 17 the long *a* sound is repeated fifty times (ten times in the combination *ain*). And so from stanza 14 to 17 the sound is very much alive; similarly the "b" rime, "take," of 18, which repeats the "a" of 15. Nor does this tell the whole story. For there are *i* and *e* sounds gently interwoven. Furthermore, a delicate net of alliteration closely binds together stanzas 13 and 14, and stretches out, though more loosely, through stanzas 15 and 16.

⁷ II, ix, 13-15. Note that the "b" rime of 14 is the "a" of 15.

should have been affected in the same way. Not all, but most, of Spenser's dull prosaic verse can be found in the first line of any stanza following an exciting passage—one that seemed to move along briskly for both author and reader. An eloquent example is the first line of the stanza following the passage in which "wanton maidens" bathe themselves while Guyon, and the reader, pay close attention—"On which when gazing him the palmer saw"!⁸

A line like this—and there are many nearly as bad—illustrates what happens when a break-down occurs in the metrical rhythm of a stanza. Indeed, it is chiefly by examining unsuccessful stanzas that we can begin to understand the importance of metrical rhythm for controlling the balance of each stanza and, through the balance, the continuity. When Spenser is forced to turn away from an attractive subject, when the stanzas of a long dull speech must be patched together,⁹ when dialogue occurs within the stanza¹⁰—we frequently have, not a balanced and indissoluble stanza, but a series of lines.¹¹

But when, as most of the time, the stanza is a perfect whole, we can find many skilful adjustments by which the poet, within the framework of the narrow architectural structure, controls the balance and the tempo. A stanza does not necessarily come to a full

⁸ II, xii, 69. Cf. II, xii, 34; II, ii, 56; I, ix, 52. It is also true that Spenser's effort to link stanzas by rhetorical means causes a large number of bad first lines.

⁹ As II, i, 49-56, ending with the gasping line, "'Which when I, wretch'—Not one word more she sayd."

¹⁰ Spenser likes to begin a stanza with the speech of a character. By doing so he gains the immediate acceleration he consciously, though often awkwardly, cultivates. But he recognizes the limitations of his medium and handles dialogue within the stanza with apparent reluctance, and only after careful uninspired planning—*curiosa infelicitas*. A frequent division is that in which the second voice takes over after the fifth line. Or see the more complex, but wooden, IV, ii, 48.

¹¹ Spenser can also break up the stanza deliberately, for a special purpose—as in the Cave of Care (IV, v, 40-41). In these stanzas the rhythm is jerky, like the nodding head of one dozing off and awaking. The cesura comes after the fourth syllable in practically every line. The rimes come down with a shock, and within the nine lines of the stanza sounds can echo like loud repercussions in a narrow enclosure. It is from an example like this that we can get some insight into Spenser's ability to weld the stanza together. Only deliberately, or when he sleeps, does he let the stanza fall apart.

conclusive stop in the last line. If its balance leans forward, the rhythm will flow, with slight interruption, into the following stanza. The forward impetus can be held back¹² or accelerated by the movement of the thought, the grammatical structures, the use of stress-shifts and runover lines, the weight of the rimes, the combinations of consonants. If the "a" rimes are light, the contrasting weight of the "b" rimes increases the forward impetus of the stanza.¹³ If the final "b" rime (the crucial place of balance for the whole stanza) is heavy, and is not smoothly absorbed into the "c" theme, the forward impetus will be slowed. Usually, when this happens, the final alexandrine, for reasons of stanza balance, will be heavy and conclusive.¹⁴ At other times, however, it may be a light rhythmical wave moving swiftly to set in motion the first wave of a new rhythm.

ARNOLD STEIN

University of Minnesota

THE AUTHOR OF "THE ADDRESS" IN QUARLES'S
SHEPHEARDS ORACLES

At the beginning of Francis Quarles's posthumous volume *The Shepheards Oracles* (1646) there is an Address to the Reader which is commonly attributed to Izaak Walton. The attribution, first made by Sir Harris Nicolas in his edition of *The Complete Angler*,

¹² This for instance is done in the stanza that portrays Maleger (II, xi, 22). The rhythm never carries over, but stops at each rime, and the effect is that of the daubing of a brush. The heavy rimes are in keeping with the strong strokes, and both the poetic and pictorial lines are stiff and hard. Spenser maintains a deft control over the nervous qualities of his stanza. When the Red Cross Knight is rescued from the dungeon of Pride, his voice is listless and sick. The verse barely drags itself along limply. The Knight's speech gasps along on monosyllables (I, viii, 38).

¹³ As in II, iv, 6.

¹⁴ As in III, xii, 20, where the "b" rime is unusually strong, partly because of the rhythm of the stanza, and partly because the rime has been the "b" rime of the preceding stanza. Here is the alexandrine: "That dyde in sanguine red her skin all snowy cleene." Notice how the combinations of consonants slow down and weight the line, with the last two words and the strong rime acting as a powerful brake.

1836, (1, xxvi), has passed unchallenged ever since; even the Nonesuch edition of Walton in 1929 included it (pp. 581-2) without questioning its authenticity.

Nicolas argued that as "Quarles had been secretary to Walton's friend Archbishop Usher, and as he was a zealous royalist, and apparently an angler, he was perhaps personally known to Walton." Since both men knew the Marriots, who published the volume, Nicolas continues, "nothing is more probable than that they should have requested him to write the prefatory matter to a posthumous work, which was to appear upon their responsibility. The internal evidence that the Address was written by Walton is so strong, that it will be inserted without the slightest fear of its not being attributed to the real author."

Nicolas's case for the acquaintance of Walton and Quarles is so flimsy that it may be dismissed without comment; and the internal evidence that seemed so strong to him proves on examination to consist of little more than a mention of fishing. The Address concludes:

Reader, at this time and place, the Author contracted a friendship with certain single-hearted Shepheards: with whom (as he return'd from his River-recreations) he often rested himselfe, and whilst in the calm evening their flocks fed about them, heard that discourse, which (with the Shepheards names) is presented in these Eglogues.

A friend of the Authors wisht me to tell thee so, this 9. of Novem. 1645.

Jo: MARIOT.

The last eclogue (xi), in which the shepherds Philarchus, Philorthus, and Anarchus discuss the predicament of the English Church under the attacks of the Root-and-Branch party, written probably in 1643, was published separately at Oxford in June 1644 under the title *The Shepheards Oracle* and appended to the second edition of *The Shepheards Oracles*, the date of the Address to the Reader being changed from 9. of Novem. 1645 to 23. of Novem. 1645. There were three editions of *The Shepheards Oracles* with title pages dated 1646. While the last eclogue was concerned with recent events, the other ten belong to an earlier decade. They too are discussions of religion between such shepherds as Gallio and Britanus, Arminius and Philamnus, Nullifidius and Pseudo-catholicus; but from references to contemporary events it is possible to

date them all between 1630 and 1633. The death of Gustavus Adolphus in 1632 is the subject of Eclogue x.

It was just at this time that Quarles "contracted a friendship" with Phineas Fletcher, probably through their common patron Edward Benlowes, to whom both the *Emblemes* (1635) and *The Purple Island* (1633) were dedicated.¹ Quarles contributed some commendatory verses to Fletcher's book; and in the *Piscatorie Eglogs and Other Poeticall Miscellanies*, which Fletcher published also in 1633, Quarles appears as Thenot in the elaborate pastoral, or rather, piscatorial convention centering about their connection with Cambridge. As Fletcher was really a "shepherd" in the ecclesiastical sense demanded by *The Shepheards Oracles*, it seems likely that he or one of the "single-hearted" friends he celebrates is the author of the Address to the Reader.

GORDON S. HAIGHT

Yale University

HAMLET, MELANCHOLY, AND THE DEVIL

In explaining his distrust of the Ghost, Hamlet says that perhaps the Devil,

Out of my weakness and my melancholy—
As he is very potent with such spirits—
Abuses me to damn me.¹

This association of the Devil, melancholy, and delusion is based upon psychiatric theories which have long been discarded and forgotten. The present paper is an attempt to sketch the background which once gave meaning to the passage quoted.

One reads in Renaissance works on medicine and psychology that persons in whom the melancholy humor is abnormally abundant are subject to mental aberrations arising from "unico illo humore, uel fuliginoso atrae bilis uapore, mentis sedem inficiente."² Melancholy men "inuent continually some one or other strange imagination" and are prone to develop irrational obsessions "from which

¹ See *The Library*, xvi (September 1935), 188-209.

² *Hamlet*, II, ii, 638-40 (Oxford Shakespeare).

³ Johann Wier, *De Praestigiis Daemonum . . . Libri Sex* (Basel, 1568), p. 228.

they cannot [readily] be weined."⁸ Some even see "bugbears" and talk "with black men, ghosts, gob'lins, &c."⁹

Because of this mental instability, the Devil finds it easy to delude melancholy men. Melancholy is a humor into which "uti aptae suis operationibus materiae non illibenter se insinuare solet daemonium."⁵ It is "the Devil's Bath, and, as *Agrippa* proves," invites demonic visitation.⁶ The Devil works primarily upon the imagination, which "he moves . . . by mediation of humours."⁷

Satan's purpose, of course, is to lead his victim to damnation. To do so, he employs various artifices. Sometimes he causes the melancholy man to brood over his sins until he develops the obsession that he is doomed to hellfire. Thus he commits the sin of distrusting God's mercy. Some melancholics, "diuinae misericordiae diffidentes, se orco destinatos, lamentatione sedulo nocte diuque deplorant."⁸ "The principal agent and procurer of [despair] is the Devil," and his ordinary means of provoking it "is the melancholy humour . . . Black choler is . . . a bait to allure" him.⁹ Another stratagem of the Devil's is to produce in the melancholic's mind the impious illusion that he is a prophet of God. Melancholy persons troubled "by the intercourse or meddling of euill angels . . . oftentimes . . . foretell & forge very strange things in their imaginations."¹⁰ They believe themselves "inspired by

⁸ André du Laurens, *A Discourse of the Preservation of the Sight*, tr. Richard Surphlet (London, 1599; Shakespeare Association Facsimiles, 1938), p. 96.

⁹ Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. A. R. Shilleto (London, 1926-27), I, 445. Dover Wilson, in commenting on Hamlet's doubts regarding the Ghost, observes that some sixteenth century authors explain specters as melancholic fancies. See his *What Happens in Hamlet* (New York, 1935), pp. 63-64.

⁵ Wier, *De Praestigiis*, p. 531. Cf. Marsiglio Ficino, *De Vita Libri Tres* (Basel, 1549), p. 20; Cornelius Agrippa, *De Occulta Philosophia Libri Tres* (Cologne, 1533), p. 78; Girolamo Fracastoro, *Opera Omnia* (Venice, 1555), fol. 203r.

⁶ Burton, *Anatomy*, I, 493.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 228.

⁸ Wier, *De Praestigiis*, pp. 227-28. Cf. Jason Pratensis, *De Cerebri Morbis . . . Liber* (Basel, 1549), p. 271; Felix Plater, *Praxeos* (Basel, 1602), pp. 98-99.

⁹ Burton, *Anatomy*, III, 452-53.

¹⁰ Du Laurens, *Discourse*, p. 100.

the Holy Ghost, full of the spirit." ¹¹ According to some authors, Satan commonly entices melancholic old women to renounce God in return for supernatural powers which subsequently they fancy they exercise. In other words, he gives them the illusion that they are witches. Into their corrupted imaginations he slips "uelut sedem suis studijs accommodatam." ¹²

Satan singles out melancholy persons, then, because they are easy prey. Through the medium of their melancholy he is able to cause delusions of various sorts to frighten, to confuse, to induce despair, to provoke crimes such as heresy, blasphemy, renunciation of God. It is obvious that the Devil "is very potent with" melancholy men and often abuses them to damn them.

LAWRENCE BABB

Michigan State College

THE SOURCE OF THE PRINCIPAL PLOT OF *THE FAIR MAID OF THE INN*

In his introduction to *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, Weber remarked that "The origin of the principal part of the plot . . . is one of the twelve *Novelas Exemplares* of Cervantes, entitled *La Illustre Fregona*."¹ Weber's statement is neither true nor well expressed. At best, as will be shown, Cervantes' story could have suggested only a few points in one of the sub-plots, or, if one wishes, in one of the complications introduced into the main plot. Seeing in a story, however, "the origin of the principal part of the plot" is perhaps hardly the same as identifying it as the source of the play; yet modern critics have repeatedly reaffirmed and as often denied that *La illustre Fregona* was the source of *The Fair Maid of*

¹¹ Burton, *Anatomy*, I, 465. Cf. Wier, *De Praestigiis*, p. 228.

¹² Wier, *De Praestigiis*, p. 16. Wier was the principal proponent of this unorthodox but widely known theory of witchcraft. Burton mentions three authors who supported him and eight who attacked him (*Anatomy*, I, 240-41). Reginald Scot's *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584) gave Wier's ideas currency in England. *DNB* lists seven English writers (including King James) who attacked Scot between 1587 and 1668 and two seventeenth century Englishmen who defended him.

¹ Quoted by Dyce, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher* (London, 1846), x, 4.

the Inn, misled in part by Weber and in greater part, perhaps, by the unwarranted assumption that the title-rôle of a play would be prominent in the principal plot.² Professor Schelling, for example, wrote that the play's "source is *La Ilustre Fregona*, which is followed only as to the main plot, and not very closely";³ Macaulay observed that "The plot of the play does not at all resemble the story *La ilustre Fregona*,"⁴ which, Oliphant added, "has been declared to be the source of the play."⁵ Those who have turned to the novel expecting to find a story similar to that of the play, have found so little that they have perhaps been blinded to what little similarity there is. It is utterly absurd to say that *La ilustre Fregona* is the source of *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, yet Weber's statement may be accepted if a minor part is substituted for "the principal part of the plot."

The principal plot of the play is concerned with the feud between Alberto and Baptista, naval commanders and former friends. As appendages to this main plot, there are two love affairs; that of Baptista's son, Mentivole, and Alberto's daughter, Clarissa, and that of Alberto's son, Cesario, and Bianca, the fair maid of the inn, who is discovered to be the daughter of Baptista. The two love affairs are given about equal space, but the part of Clarissa is somewhat larger than that of Bianca, the title-rôle. Clarissa appears in 6 scenes, is given 50 speeches for a total of 162 lines; Bianca appears in 5 scenes, has 36 speeches for a total of 144 lines. That these love affairs are but appendages is shown by the long closing scene of the play: Bianca makes only one speech—a speech of four words; Clarissa delivers two speeches, one of six words and one of thirty lines, but the longer speech is a passionate plea for the restoration of the "ancient friendship" of those

Divided now in passion for a brawl
The makers blush to own.

² In the Beaumont and Fletcher plays—as in those of other Elizabethan dramatists—the title-rôle is frequently found in the sub-plot. Cf. *The Little French Lawyer*, *Nice Valour* or *The Passionate Madman*, *The False One*, *The Spanish Curate*, *The Humorous Lieutenant*.

³ F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston and New York, [1908]), II, 206.

⁴ *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, VI, 158.

⁵ E. H. C. Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1927), p. 467.

Of the fourteen scenes in the play, no fewer than eight are concerned wholly or in large part with the theme of friendship, feud, and reconciliation. Divested of the love story appendages and of the four scenes in which simple folk are cosened by the pretended conjuror, Forobosco, the play may be summarized as follows:

I, i, presents the long friendship of the two comrades in arms, Baptista and Alberto. Their sons, Mentivole and Cesario, agree to wager on a race between their horses.

I, iii. Mentivole and Cesario quarrel over the conduct of the race, Cesario having won by fouling Mentivole's horse. They fight; Cesario is carried off wounded. Baptista, entering, angrily reproves Mentivole for having fought with the son of his old friend and swears that he will have nothing more to do with him until he has sued for and obtained pardon from Alberto.

II, i. Mentivole, submitting to his father's demands, comes to seek Alberto's pardon, but the older man angrily orders his servants to

"Bind him, and cut off's right hand presently:
Fair words shall never satisfy foul deeds:
Chop 's hand off."

Before the order is carried out, however, a messenger brings a summons to Alberto to attend the duke immediately. He leaves with the final order: "Take away his use of fighting." Cesario, who had previously sought to dissuade his father from depriving Mentivole of his right hand, now fulfills his father's order by merely taking from Mentivole his sword (and a ring given him by Clarissa).

II, iii. Baptista, informed of Alberto's treatment of Mentivole, vows: "I will revenge on the whole family."

II, iv. Mariana, wife to Alberto and Cesario's mother, testifies that

"The family of the Baptisti
Are grown to faction, and, upon distaste
Of the injury late offer'd in my house,
Have vow'd a most severe and fell revenge
'Gainst all our family."

Cesario, she says,

"shall never
Go forth o' doors, but the contrary faction
Will endanger 's life; and then am I most wretched.
I am thinking of a strange prevention,
Which I shall witness with a bleeding eye."

III, ii. The Duke, after noting the outrages, the waste of blood, etc., which have resulted from warring factions both in Rome and in Florence, warns Baptista that

"the petty brawls and quarrels
 Late urg'd betwixt the Alberti and your family
 Must (yes, and shall), like tender unknit joints,
 Fasten again together of themselves;
 Or, like an angry chirurgeon, we will use
 The roughness of our justice, to cut off
 The stubborn rancour of the limbs offending."

Mariana now reveals the "strange prevention" of which she had spoken in II, iv. To protect Cesario against the revenge of the Baptisti, she declares him to be no son of Alberto, no son of hers, but a falconer's son whom she had owned as hers because of Alberto's desire for a son.

v, i. Alberto, who had been thought lost at sea, returns to Florence. Like Mariana in II, iv, he testifies that many have died in the feud of the two families, although the play throws no further light on the identity of those slain. In a review, thought necessary perhaps because of the absence of this plot throughout Act iv, Alberto says:

" . . . at my going to sea,
 Upon a quarrel, and a hurt receiv'd
 From young Mentivole, my rage so far
 O'er-topt my nobler temper, I gave charge
 To have his hand cut off; which since I heard,
 And to my comfort, brave Cesario
 Worthily prevented. . . .
 Yet the revenge for this intent of mine
 Hath bred much slaughter in our families."

v, iii. Although the quarrel between Alberto and Baptista, as they meet in the presence of the Duke, reaches a high pitch, the reconciliation of the two families is brought about by the love and betrothal of the son and daughter of one house to the daughter and son of the other.

No suggestion of the friendship-feud-reconciliation theme is to be found either in *La ilustre Fregona* or in Caussin's *La cour sainte* or other known stories in which a mother denies her parentage of a son and is by a wise judge, as in *The Fair Maid*, ordered to marry him. Very clearly this friendship-feud plot, which is the principal action of *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, is taken directly from a tradition of the beginning of the famous Neri-Bianchi feud in Florence. The action of the play is, of course, laid in Florence, and that the authors were familiar with the Neri-Bianchi feud is shown by the Duke's referring in III, ii, to

"the sad example
 At Rome, between the Ursins and the Columnas,
 Nay, here at home, in Florence, 'twixt the Neris
 And the Bianchi."

The particular account of the feud which was used by the authors of the play, it is doubtless impossible to determine, for they have added and subtracted freely to permit the admission of the two love stories. But one account of the origin of the feud was easily accessible to the dramatists in a small volume ascribed to R. Dallington and printed at London in 1605: "A SVRVEY OF THE GREAT DVKES STATE of *Tuscany*. In the yeare of our Lord 1596. AT LONDON Printed for *Edward Blount*. 1605." In his brief discussion of Pistoria, Dallington wrote:

This Towne is famous, or rather infamous, for the two factions of the *Bianchi* and *Nerey*, which ruined themselues, and troubled the peace of *Florence* also: it began thus. Two yong Gentlemen of the Towne falling out, and so proceeding from words to blowes, it chanced one of them receiued a light hurt, The father of the other (because he would kill all motions to a farther quarrell) sends his Sonne to aske a pardon of the Father and Parentage of the other whom he had hurt: but he causing his seruants to lay hold on him, commaunded his right hand to be cut off, and sent him away with this answer: *Va dal tuo Padre & digli, che le ferite non si curano con parole ma col ferro*; Goe to thy father and tell him, hurts are not cured with wordes, but with the sword. Hereupon grew that great and bloudie enmitie betweene those two houses, which drew into it all the great families of *Pistoia*, as also them of *Florence*, where the *Donati* banded with the *Neri*, and the *Circhi*, with the *Bianchi*.⁶

From Dallington or from some similar account of the Neri-Bianchi quarrel the dramatists drew the material for their main plot, the Alberti-Baptisti feud: the quarrel of the two sons, the wounding of one, the father's demanding that his son seek pardon of the victim's father, the father of the wounded man giving orders that the right hand of his son's assailant be cut off, the resulting enmity which caused great slaughter, twice referred to in the play but not presented on the stage. The only change from the old story is in the happy ending of the play—in a reconciliation brought about by the introduction of the two love stories and of the device by which Mariana saves the life of her son Cesario. Here, I think the dramatists may well have used Cervantes' *La ilustre Fregona* and Caussin's *La cour sainte*.⁷ Obviously, however, much from

⁶P. 19. I quote from a microfilm of the copy in the Yale University Library.

⁷For a discussion of which version of this story was used, Caussin's, Joannes Magnus', or some other, see F. L. Lucas, *The Complete Works of John Webster* (Boston and New York, 1928), iv, 147, and II, 218-221.

these stories had to be changed and more omitted in fitting them into a background of a family feud. In *La cour sainte* the mother, a widow, denies her son because of the objection to him by one who has promised her marriage; in the play her husband remains alive, and, although somewhat unconvincing, since it was Cesario who really began the quarrel, it was a very happy adaptation to the main plot to have Mariana deny her son in order to protect him from the angry Baptisti.

Of *La ilustre Fregona*, the dramatists would obviously have to omit much. Cervantes' novel is rather long, and the part of Bianca in the play is subordinate in length even to that of Clarissa. The earlier part of the novel, the wondering disposition of one young man, the decision of his friend to accompany him, their leaving home together, ostensibly to study, their serving together in disguise at an inn far distant from their home—all of this would have been quite incompatible with the main plot which emphasized the depth and bitterness of the family feud. In fitting the story of the novel into that of the play the dramatists have used all that was readily adaptable. In both novel and play the one known as the maid of the inn had been born in the inn at a time when her mother, a rich and high-born lady, separated from the father, was, for the sake of her health, traveling—in the novel to the shrine at Guadaloupe, in the play to the baths at Lucca (a change perhaps dictated by the necessary shift of the scene from Spain to Florence). In each case the girl is brought up as the daughter of the host, attracts by her beauty the attention of a youth of high station, and is in the end married to him when it is revealed that she is of gentle birth, her father the longtime friend of the young man's father.

We may conclude, then, that, although *La ilustre Fregona* cannot be, as it has frequently been declared, "the source" of *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, the dramatists may well have borrowed certain situations from it which could be blended into and promote a happy ending to the source of their main plot, the family feud of the Neri and the Bianchi.

BALDWIN MAXWELL

University of Iowa

MATERIALS FOR THE STUDY OF ENGLISH
RENAISSANCE DRAMA

Authorship and Sources of "Gentleness and Nobility": A Study in Early Tudor Drama, Together with a Text of the Play Based on the Black-Letter Original. By KENNETH WALTER CAMERON. Raleigh, North Carolina: The Thistle Press, 1941. Pp. 132. \$2.75. (Text Alone. Pp. 36. \$75.)

John Heywood's "Play of the Wether": A Study in Early Tudor Drama. By KENNETH WALTER CAMERON. Raleigh, North Carolina: The Thistle Press, 1941. Pp. 65. \$1.75.

The Background of John Heywood's "Witty and Witless": A Study in Early Tudor Drama, Together with a Specialized Bibliography of Heywood Scholarship. By KENNETH WALTER CAMERON. Raleigh, North Carolina: The Thistle Press, 1941. Pp. 46. \$1.25.

The Wars of Cyrus: An Early Classical Narrative Drama of the Child Actors. Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes. By JAMES PAUL BRAWNER. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, Vol. XXVII, Nos. 3-4), 1942. Pp. 163. \$2.50. (Paper bound: \$2.00.)

The Fary Knight or Oberon the Second: A Manuscript Play Attributed to Thomas Randolph. Edited by FREDSON THAYER BOWERS. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press (*University of Virginia Studies*, No. 2), 1942. Pp. xlvi + 87. \$3.00.

Pathomachia: An Edition. A Dissertation By PAUL EDWARD SMITH. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 182.

Technogamia. By BARTEN HOLYDAY: A Critical Edition. A Dissertation by SISTER M. JEAN CARMEL CAVANAUGH. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942. Pp. lxxvii + 253.

The Oration in Shakespeare. By MILTON BOONE KENNEDY. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942. Pp. x + 270. \$3.00.

Shakespeare and The Nature of Man. By THEODORE SPENCER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. Pp. xii + 233. \$2.75.

Climates of Tragedy. By WILLIAM VAN O'CONNOR and MARY ALLEN O'CONNOR. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. Pp. xi + 155. \$1.75.

Hamlet: The Prince or the Poem? By C. S. LEWIS. *Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1942.* London: Humphrey Milford; New York: Oxford University Press, n.d. Pp. 18. \$.60.

The books here brought together for brief survey range for material from the first quarter of the sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth. All treat of the drama, and the majority perform the most welcome of services in making texts available. Several go to the capital of the realm by treating of Shakespeare. In addition to the editorial, survey, and critical tasks which they undertake, most of the authors earnestly try to prove something. Presumably it is part of the duty of the reviewer to tell whether he personally has been convinced.

Mr. Cameron's brochures all deal with Tudor interludes by, or claimed for, John Heywood. The discussion of *Gentleness and Nobility*, dated somewhat impressionistically about 1523, begins with a useful analysis of the points of debate in this vital old dialogue, and an interesting discussion of the background of Renaissance thought concerning social distinction and the basis of nobility. Mr. Cameron seems so anxious to prove that the sources are "conservative" and that we are not intended to take seriously the subversive views of the radical contestant that he tends to make a fourth in the debate and come to the aid of the Knight and Merchant against the Ploughman. That the latter is a rude and humorous character needs no demonstration, but that the ideas he voices are "sentimental," or satirically intended, seems a view more revealing of the attitude of the commentator than of the author. Mr. Cameron demurs at A. W. Reed's decision that this author is John Rastell, advancing instead the claims of Heywood. His arguments against Rastell's sole authorship are more cogent than those for his own candidate. The possibility is not excluded of some wholly unknown author, or of a collaboration between Rastell and Heywood. Mr. Cameron concludes with apparent caution that "the probabilities are in Heywood's favor," that he is "not an impossible candidate"; but he assigns the play to Heywood without qualification in the separately bound text of the dialogue edited from the black-letter original. This useful text appears also as an appendix to the study.

In his essay upon *Witty and Witless* Mr. Cameron demonstrates that the dialogue reflects in general the humanistic Christianity of More and Erasmus, and owes specific debts to much of their writing in addition to the frequently cited *Encomium Moriae*. Details are traced to numerous works by other writers, most revealingly to Tractatus LXVII of St. Augustine's *Expositio in Evangelium Secundum Johannem*. The date favored for the interlude is c. 1522 when Henry's attack upon Luther, and Luther's reply, would have made the theological language and strongly Catholic tone most timely. An odd qualification accompanies this conjectural date. Mr. Cameron notes that the time of composition must have been subsequent to the entrance of Summers into the service of Henry VIII, an event dated by a modern scholar in 1525. Could not Mr. Cameron have consulted directly with this scholar instead of searching vainly for his authority? In treating *Play of the Wether*, Mr. Cameron convincingly rejects Aesop and endorses Lucian's *Icaromenippus*, with the addition of *Bis Accusatus*, as the source. He dates the play, after a method anticipated by Pollard, probably 1527-28 when a seven year period of destructive rains came to an end:

And well it is knownen to the most foole here
How rayne hath pryced corne within this vii yere,

and certainly after 1525 when King Henry reformed court regulations. Mr. Cameron believes that the play deals partly with conflict of classes, that Henry is represented in Jupiter, and that many allusions in the dialogue illustrate "rich possibilities of historical analogy."

A handsome volume by Mr. James P. Brawner combines what seems to the reviewer to be a completely admirable edition of a play together with a completely misdirected discussion of its date and authorship. Mr. Brawner is so eager to prove that *The Wars of Cyrus* (printed anonymously in 1594) was written by Richard Farrant and performed at Blackfriars about 1576-77 that his long introduction seems prejudiced throughout. It is true that Farrant may have been the author of a song which may have fitted into this play, and that the title page mentions performance by the Chapel, long inactive by 1594, but here any real evidence ends. Mr. Brawner hypothecates an editor of the 1594 text to account for its present state; but this editor, carefully excising traces of antiquity, yet letting the prologue come in after line 600, is quite incredible. So also is the hypothetical setting of the play, with the river Euphrates dividing the camp of Cyrus from the court of Antiochus presumably in the "neo-classical" fashion of the Blackfriars stage. Always confronting us is the play itself, with its latter-day versification and, whether it be technically a conqueror play or not, its post-*Tamburlaine* type of grandiosity. Mr. Brawner explains intrusive details as indicative of the author's "originality," thus offering us a clear choice: Farrant was miraculously original or he did not write the play. We are obliged to accept the lesser wonder, recognizing still Mr. Brawner's care, competence, and success in presenting the text itself.

Mr. Fredson T. Bowers also has a hard case to plead in his introduction to *The Fury Knight*, an amateurish entertainment preserved in a manuscript dating apparently from late in the Commonwealth period. The play, edited in meticulously diplomatic form, is attributed to Thomas Randolph. Since it seems not good enough for Randolph, it is presumed to be *juvenilia*; and since it contains reminiscences from *The Traitor* and other plays written after Randolph's death, it is presumed to have been revised by a reader of Shirley. Why then, we might ask, should it not be Shirley *juvenilia* revised by a reader of Randolph? or the work of some Commonwealth juvenile who had read both Shirley and Randolph? Mr. Bowers finds the Randolph touch most pervasive, and finds hints of an original date about the time his candidate was in Westminster School. It is hard to say. The hints are only hints, and Mr. Bowers is sometimes too easily satisfied with verbal parallels; yet his earnest conviction doggedly presented through introduction and textual notes cannot be ignored: he has at least established a possi-

bility, and enabled us to read for ourselves a hitherto inaccessible play.

The editions of Barten Holyday's *Technogamia* by Sister M. Jean Carmel Cavanaugh, and of the anonymous *Pathomachia* by Mr. Paul E. Smith suggest the meekness of doctoral candidacy in having nothing to prove. Both are creditable specimens of their kind. The plays edited are cruelly dull academic allegories, but they have a significance for the historian of ethics and psychological theory. Mr. Smith's preface, eloquent of the vagaries of early bibliographers, leaves in about its present status the possible claim of Thomas Tomkis to the play. Dr. Cavanaugh provides us with much entertaining material about the performance of *Technogamia* before King James, and the raillery showered upon the luckless author. In general, the preparation of this volume has been the more careful and complete of the two. Its one sad defect seems accidental. Either through bad inking or through photographic reduction, the text of the play, printed in offset, is sometimes all but illegible. Those who wonder whether the type of editing sponsored by the Malone Society could not just as well be done by a camera are here given an answer.

Mr. Kennedy's book on the oration in Shakespeare, outgrowth of a succession of studies worked over in a succession of universities, contains good solid stuff. The eighty-three orations of the plays are treated in chapters, usually incorporating tabular charts and parallel quotations, discussing such topics as classification, structure, sources, integration of the passage in the play, etc. The style is sometimes labored, especially in the introductory and quite important survey of classical and later theories of the relation of diction and thought, but elsewhere the author is sufficiently kindled by his subject to indulge in a few tints of those colors of rhetoric which he treats. He is by no means indifferent to the wider reaches of his subject. He finds in Shakespeare the ever-developing, ever-excelling conscious artist, whose dramatic orations, whose "rhetoric in poetic," veered steadily from the example of Seneca to the precept of Aristotle.

The work yet to be noticed in this quite inadequate round-up is primarily critical. Although Mr. Spencer makes no mention of Santayana, his volume seems almost intended to answer the philosopher's disturbing charge that "the cosmos eludes" Shakespeare, in whom we seek in vain "not this or that system but some system," and who portrays life "without a setting and consequently without a meaning." Mr. Spencer begins by describing the philosophical and religious pattern of the universe still available in Shakespeare's day. It was an "optimistic" pattern with neatly articulated hierarchies of Cosmos, State, and Man, with Man's place central, his function clear, his destiny great. After devoting his book to a

discussion of Shakespeare's plays in relation to this cosmological pattern, Mr. Spencer concludes with a fact "previously only hinted"—that Shakespeare transcended conventional concepts and treated "the thing itself underlying codification." Since this "thing itself" is no other than "the individual human life" (precisely Santayana's point), the avowal comes as a surprise because—and only because—the antecedent discussion has had the appearance of giving the plays a cosmic setting. The critic seems to have been concerned with the setting Shakespeare did not give his plays.

Such an impression of Mr. Spencer's work is unsympathetic. Since Shakespeare never troubled to deny the current cosmology, treating it rather as a ruins and quarry, there are metaphors and whole speeches scattered suggestively through his work. But these are debris, possibly no more abundant or significant than debris from the classical pantheon, and Mr. Spencer would not wish to make a book from such details. He believes that there is a genuine correspondence between Shakespeare's dramatic universe and that old formulation, Man, State, Cosmos; and, of course, there is—at least to the extent that in Shakespeare's dramatic universe there are Self, Others, and the Unknown. Mr. Spencer believes also that Shakespeare's consciousness of the impending dissolution of the old formulation in the acid of the new era intensified his sense of tragic conflict—between the ideal and the real, the good appearance and the evil actuality. To the reviewer it seems possible that Mr. Spencer is more saddened by the departing certainties of three hundred years ago than was Shakespeare. Many now seek shelter from the wind who then would have been exhilarated by the fresh air. Mr. Spencer is fond both of Shakespeare and the idea of a patterned universe: he writes about both. If there is an imperfect correspondence between the poet's work and the critic's explication, we should not complain. In most criticism the great irrelevance is the critic. One may say this without impertinence if he adds that critics also are worth knowing—especially when they write so pleasantly as Mr. Spencer.

Mr. O'Conner's book on the climates of tragedy touches the drama of Elizabethan England briefly. He finds the climate then, as in Periclean Greece, propitious; the climate now, unpropitious. Much of the rest of what he finds is divorced from the reader by an excessively abstract style and an excessively solemn tone. One finds himself unwilling to expend the energy required to decide whether a statement like the following has meaning:

Understanding, or if one will, spirit, may be thought of as the moral focus of an individual born of the reaction of the psychic to the "ambient forces" about it.

The book is full of a fierce longing for the fancied austerities of the past.

The Annual Shakespeare Lecture by Mr. Lewis reminds us of Goldsmith's opinion that if angels should write books, they would not write folios. His eighteen pages are charming in themselves, yet meet the acid test of writing in this vein by making us reach again for the book. With a disarming pose of guilelessness, Mr. Lewis reminds us that *Hamlet* in the hands of the analysts is often not much fun. He suggests surrender to the mood of the poem, a response that is "naive and concrete and archaic." It is a reminder that simple responsiveness to a work of art precedes, both in time and in importance, our competitive interpretations and verbal exercises. To his query, *The Man or the Poem?* we reply, at the moment anyway, *The Poem*: and return to

night, ghosts, a castle, a lobby where a man can walk four hours together, a willow-fringed brook and a sad lady drowned, a graveyard and a terrible cliff above the sea, and amidst all these a pale man in black clothes . . . with his stockings coming down, a dishelled man whose words make us at once think of loneliness and doubt and dread, of waste and dust and emptiness, and from whose hands, or from our own, we feel the richness of heaven and earth and the comfort of human affection slipping away.

ALFRED HARBAGE

University of Pennsylvania

REVIEWS

A Short View of Elizabethan Drama, together with some account of its principal playwrights and the conditions under which it was produced. By THOMAS MARC PARROTT and ROBERT HAMILTON BALL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. v + 311. \$1.80.

"Courtesy" in Shakespeare. By M. M. BHATTACHERJE. With a Foreword by Professor C. J. SISSON and an Introduction by Professor LOUIS CAZAMIAN. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1940. Pp. xix + 225.

Shakespeare's Satire. By OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL. New York: Oxford University Press, 1943. Pp. xii + 227. \$3.75.

William Shakspere's Petty School. By T. W. BALDWIN. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943. Pp. 240.

Four wartime books, all interesting and all bearing on the subject of Elizabethan drama, are listed above.

The most inclusive of these books is a brief history of Eliza-

bethan drama by Professors Parrott and Ball. It requires years of careful appreciative study to be able to write about Elizabethan drama as these authors do. Particularly noteworthy are the chapters on Marlowe, Heywood, Chapman, Jonson, Massinger, and Brome, the last-mentioned being a belated but just recognition of merit. The chapter on Middleton is hardly a solution of the Middleton mystery, but its plain and scholarly quality gives great satisfaction. The account of Tourneur bestows on him a new unity in character and career, and Marston, at least in tragedy, assumes a new importance. The treatment of Beaumont and Fletcher is not very satisfactory, but with the limited space at the disposal of the authors they could hardly have done better. Beaumont is somewhat doubtfully regarded as the dominating influence. The article on Ford is the least satisfactory of the lot, because it insists on giving too much prominence to the Astrophel and Stella story and rather neglects Ford's relation to drama then in vogue at court; however, it is excellent at the end. The discussion of Webster leaves little to be desired, and the authors see no objection to the assignment to him of *Appius and Virginia*. A good deal of space is devoted to summaries of plots, a necessity forced on those who discuss Elizabethan plays for modern readers. Most of these précis are extremely well done.

Unfortunately the authors have nothing to say about Shakespeare, who ought to be considered in the book because he is indispensable and because it would have been a matter of great interest to have the opinions of these authors on Shakespeare's relation to the drama of his age. By omitting the first two chapters of the book room might have been found for Shakespeare. These chapters add very little, since it is not possible to treat the earlier drama adequately in such limited space. The effect in these chapters is to give the impression of error. They fail, for example, to show the wide variety of mystery plays (which were not all of the Corpus Christi type), to make adequate mention of miracle plays, and to give anything like a true impression of the nature and origin of moralities. They also fail to give proper emphasis to the early romantic drama. These defects are of course only apparent, since the authors did not have at their disposal the space required to treat these subjects in sufficient detail.

Dr. Bhattacherje's book is a simply written, rather factual account of Renaissance courtesy as it affected Shakespeare. The book stresses the importance of courtesy in Elizabethan thought and realizes fully the connection between courtesy and Platonic idealism. Indeed, Dr. Bhattacherje is most at home when Plato comes into consideration. The early chapters on the Chivalric Ideal of Courtesy, Renaissance Courtesy, "Nurture" and Table-Courtesy are discriminating summaries of familiar subjects, and it is in a chapter entitled Renaissance Courtesy in Shakespeare that

the newer study is embodied. Even here there are no great discoveries, but there is a fineness of spirit and a respect for significant detail that speaks well for the author and justifies his book. Castiglione's *Courtier* is a principal source of the author's formative thought, although he shows knowledge of a wide range of writers on his subject.

Professor Campbell's excellently written and brilliantly conceived book does not give entire satisfaction. It is a study of satire in Shakespeare's plays and seeks to prove that a spirit of ridicule came more and more to dominate him. The conceptions arrived at are serious matters in the interpretation of Shakespeare, so that, although admitting gratefully the excellence of the presentation and the entire adequacy of the author's knowledge, this reviewer is disposed to disagree diffidently with some at least of the principal opinions expressed in the book.

The attempt to identify satire in Shakespeare with that of formal satirists like Marston does not seem to be altogether successful. Obvious parallels do exist, but satire was and is a very common thing. There is much of it in Shakespeare, but he uses it dramatically or for ornament and not for itself as Marston does. The author does not deny this of course, but he fails to convince the reader that Shakespeare had much in common with the group of satirists of the day. The chapters on *Love's Labour's Lost*, *As You Like It*, and "Humor" Characters leave room for little but admiration, although there is perhaps too heavy a stress placed on Shakespeare's malcontents. Hamlet is, however, excellently handled, and it is admirably done to see the malcontent in Iago.

Dissatisfaction begins with the author's treatment of *Troilus and Cressida* as a satirical comedy after the dramatic pattern of *Everyman Out of his Humour*. Shakespeare had to tell the story of Troilus and Cressida as it had come down to him. He had no choice, other than misrepresentation, in presenting Cressida, and one cannot believe that he thought of Troilus as an expert in sensuality. It is difficult to regard the story as Shakespeare tells it as told with or for cynical amusement. The resemblance between either this play or *Measure for Measure* and Jonson's play is hard to see. In *Measure for Measure* Shakespeare performed a brilliant task of transforming *Promos and Cassandra* into a comedy. Again he had no choice as to the principal situations. It is doubtful if there is any satirical intention except such as he showed in other places in his description of social depravity. Angelo has the guilt of Promos, and Shakespeare has realized the character imaginatively. Angelo is not a character with whom the audience has sympathy, even after Shakespeare spares him; whereas both the Duke and Isabella are sympathetic. One fails to see why Isabella is not a proper heroine even in her marriage with the Duke, for the Elizabethans showed little sympathy with the ideals of the cloister.

The trouble with *Timon of Athens* is the theme. The old, inflexible story called for an absolute in myanthropic inactivity. Out of such a situation drama could hardly arise, especially since tragedy can come into being only within a range of action. Perhaps, if Shakespeare left the play incomplete, as he probably did, it was because he had found himself saddled with a story dramatically unworkable. That an atmosphere of derision permeates the early scenes is hard to perceive or that *Timon* is a play in the manner of *Sejanus* or that Shakespeare deliberately seeks to establish in the audience a hostile attitude toward the hero. It still seems better to think that Timon was to be honored for his perfect, albeit wasted, generosity.

To the reviewer *Coriolanus* has always seemed to be a noble tragedy. It is incredible that to Shakespeare and his audience Coriolanus was a mere victim of rage and folly. Surely Shakespeare did not look at him as an emotional automaton or a puppet or a subject for derision, and to me Menenius is far more suggestive of Enobarbus, or even Kent, than he is of Carlo Buffone. With a simpler interpretation of the interview between Coriolanus and his mother, the difficulty of the play tends to disappear. Coriolanus finds himself locked in the very jaws of fate, and that his destruction is inevitable. It is no question of a boy's frightened submission to a domineering woman; it is a question of a man's obedience to the primary laws of his being. Man is but blood and bone, the product of generation. He cannot decide against his wife, his son, and particularly his mother, for to do so is to decide against himself.

Professor Baldwin's study of Shakespeare's early schooling comprehends a detailed and original investigation of the Primer and Catechism of the sixteenth-century Church of England. His book outlines the system of religious training employed during the period, particularly during Shakespeare's youth, and shows that the petty school was primarily religious. Particularly detailed is the description of the various forms of Nowell's Catechism and their relation to other catechisms. There is a most interesting chapter on Shakespeare's Abcedarius and another of great clarity on Shakespeare's Writing and Casting Accounts. Detailed search discovers many hitherto unnoticed recollections by Shakespeare of his petty school and of his religious education. The book ends with an emphatic claim, which seems entirely justified, that the question of Shakespeare's religious affiliation has been put to rest. Shakespeare, the author contends, led a perfectly normal life within the Anglican communion—baptism, marriage, christening of children, burial. Shakespeare was trained to take part in the service of the church and to our knowledge assumed the duties of a godfather—must have taken the sacred vows required for that responsibility.

William Shakespeare, says the author, was an Anglican. The final word, not argued in the book, is to the effect that the motive force of Shakespeare's universe lies in religion, not philosophy.

University of North Carolina

HARDIN CRAIG

The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction: A History of Its Criticism and a Guide for Its Study, with an Annotated Check List of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700 to 1800. By PHILIP BABCOCK GOVE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xi + 445.

The Making of "Jonathan Wild": A Study in the Literary Method of Henry Fielding. By WILLIAM ROBERT IRWIN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 156.

The First American Novelist? By GUSTAVUS HOWARD MAYNADIER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. 79.

Charlotte Smith, Poet and Novelist (1749-1806). By FLORENCE MAY ANNA HILBISH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1941. Pp. ix + 634.

Dr. Gove rightly felt that before a history of the Imaginary Voyage can be written, a bibliographical foundation such as this must be laid, and he has established that basis in a highly competent and serviceable manner. Among the more important works which he includes are *Sindbad the Sailor*, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Gulliver's Travels*, *Prévost's Cleveland*, Holberg's *Niels Klim*, *Candide*, and *Munchausen*. The recorded items are chiefly in English, French, German, and Dutch, but also in five other languages (including a Japanese analogue of *Gulliver*); and the American or British libraries which have been searched are indicated. The factual data are interpreted in the light of an extraordinarily extensive knowledge of the history of the subject. Forgotten or neglected materials are utilized, such as James T. Presley's list of imaginary voyages (1873), and Julius Paludan's *Om Holbergs Niels Klim* (1878),—the latter of interest to students of Swift. Dr. Gove discusses clearly and judiciously the various definitions of the type which have been proposed, and its debatable subdivisions. It is to be hoped that he will bring his learned records down to the twentieth century, and that he will ultimately give us a definitive history of this important genre.

Mr. Irwin's monograph is praiseworthy for its clearness and clean-cut brevity. It expounds the relation of Fielding's ironic

history to the quasi-biographical accounts about Wild, and to the supposed parallels between his career and Walpole's which were commonplaces of political controversy between 1725 and 1742. It discusses the story as a moral parable stressing, as Fielding intended, the contrast between specious greatness and genuine goodness. Finally, it considers the similarities and differences between *Jonathan Wild* and typical criminal biographies, picaresque tales, and comic prose epics.

Dr. Irwin's reflections on Fielding's ethics and politics would, in my opinion, have been enriched if he had taken into account Dr. Maria Joesten's *Die Philosophie Fieldings* (the fundamental importance of which was pointed out in *MLN.*, XLVIII, 376). Her third chapter, "Das Naturgesetz als Grundlage der Gesellschaftsmoral," deals with *Jonathan Wild*, and shows the coherence between its attitudes and Fielding's general philosophy more thoroughly than Dr. Irwin does. Her citations from Locke's *Civil Government* might also have proved useful, as well as her perception that Fielding's ethical and political standpoint was higher than the ordinary contemporaneous outlook.

The First American Novelist contains nothing of value that has not already been set forth in Dr. Miriam R. Small's *Charlotte Ramsay Lennox* (1935).

Even the most ravenous appetite for details concerning minor authors should be satisfied by Miss Hilbush's dissertation on Charlotte Smith. Much time and care have been devoted to it; whether deservedly, is perhaps questionable. Over two hundred pages are given to Mrs. Smith's doleful biography, which is illustrated with five rather trivial mementoes. The rest of the volume consists chiefly of minute descriptive and analytical accounts of her verses, prose fictions, and books for children. The critical and historical comments, though sympathetic towards Mrs. Smith, are sensible and fair-minded. Since the subtle or intricate is absent from Charlotte Smith's writings, her interpreter is not required to possess much discernment or power of expression. Dr. Hilbush's style may be judged by these specimens:

These current fads (the study of botany and natural history) found in her love of nature a ready response, and for a diversion her writing and her own perplexities urged it (p. 217).

The course of incidents, real and probable, are used to impress the reader with sympathy (p. 298).

The Young Philosopher looks back over the past and evolves its causes (p. 299).

Although Mrs. Smith's success as a novelist has eclipsed in modern criticism recognition of her as a writer of children's stories, even in her own day her moral tales for children did not attract such notice or achieve such well deserved popularity as did her novels (p. 475).

No description of nature occurs in many other novels whose rural settings would lead one to suspect such as *Jonathan Wild*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, etc. (p. 528).

Is it captious to declare that universities which allow such English to be published are neglecting their duty?

Some of Dr. Hilbush's data and comments are valuable. Occasionally she corrects the opinions of previous students of the subject. Charlotte Smith's poetry, she maintains, though it is conventionally sentimental in manner, was wholly sincere. Her Gothicism in fiction, except in *The Story of Edouarda*, was not as extreme as commonly asserted. Her purpose in *Desmond*, *The Banished Man*, and *The Young Philosopher* was not primarily to write romances of adventure but to express her political opinions. These opinions vacillated,—but so did those of William Pitt and the rest of the nation. Whatever her faults may be, Charlotte Smith must be credited (this is, I believe, Dr. Hilbush's main contribution) with being one of the first of our novelists to make much of descriptions of nature, and in so doing she was also expressing her true feelings.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: a Survey of the Foundations of the Text. By W. W. GREG. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942. Pp. lv + 210. \$3.75.

Dr. Greg's new book falls into two distinct parts. The first is a criticism of the principles laid down by McKerrow in his *Prolegomena* for determining the copy-text, i. e. that which the editor selects as the basis of his edition of a play, and for adhering to it. These Dr. Greg redrafts in the form of seven rules. The main issue is the rigidity of the editor's obligation to follow his copy-text when alternative texts of authority are available. McKerrow's attitude was conservative; he would depart from the copy-text only when it is manifestly erroneous. Dr. Greg, though he gags at the words, calls his own attitude eclectic; when variants occur in authoritative texts he would weigh the claims of each variant individually. It is impossible in a brief review even to state the pith of the argument, technical and even abstruse as it is, let alone weigh its merits. I can only say that, while both McKerrow and Dr. Greg have in mind the projected Oxford edition only, every editor of Shakespeare can study the prescriptions they have formulated with the utmost profit.

The second, and longer, part of Dr. Greg's book, originally a series of lectures delivered at Cambridge, is his survey of the foundations of the text. It recapitulates the results of the revaluation of the original editions of the plays which has been the work of the last thirty-five years. Most of it, therefore, is a more-than-

twice-told tale; Dr. Greg is concerned with verifying and clarifying findings already brought in more than with adding new findings. His lectures are most useful, then, as an up-to-date summary of what we may reasonably assume about the authority of the original editions of Shakespeare and what we should still like to find out and as an index of the most recent progress towards understanding them. I shall try to state briefly the most interesting points which fall under the latter head.

Most important of all, I think, is Dr. Greg's differentiation of author's manuscript and prompt-book and of the kinds of printed text which would be set up from one and the other. He accepts McKerrow's argument that the author's manuscript, the foul papers as he calls it, is the basis of a number of the printed texts and that its stigmata are distinguishable from those of a prompt-book made up by the book-keeper. His position also involves accepting McKerrow's interpretation of erratic speech-prefixes and Professor Gaw's explanation of certain appearances of actors' names in speech-prefixes. It would be most helpful if these conclusions were now accepted as articles of the textual critic's faith. Dr. Greg argues that Shakespeare's foul papers were delivered to the company without invariably being reduced to final form, i. e. that insignificant details were left to be adjusted in the preparation of the prompt-book or during rehearsals. He shows reasons for assuming that the book-keeper might annotate the foul papers as the first step in preparing his prompt-book. In view of the recklessness with which enthusiasts have bandied the word "prompt-book" back and forth, Dr. Greg's discriminating discussion should be made required reading.

Another gain may now be scored, I believe, in Dr. Greg's recognition of a group of mixed texts, as he calls them, i. e. texts printed partly from one kind of copy and partly from another. The air is also cleared of some fairly dense fog by his contention that there are weighty reasons for doubting that most of the folio texts sometimes so described were set up from quartos which had been used as prompt-books. Dr. Greg is less specific than usual in dealing with the editing of the first folio, but his general statements strike me as being more lucid than anything else I can recall on that topic. We need a detailed examination of this important stage in the transmission of the text, hitherto spoken of only in the most glittering generalities.

No brief review can mention even a tithe of the provocative decisions and suggestions which Dr. Greg makes. Speaking generally, since every one expects a book on the text of Shakespeare by Dr. Greg to exhibit unequalled mastery of its materials, I am most impressed by the sanity of his treatment. As evidence I would submit his judicious discussion of ideas which the last generation of scholars have hotly debated, such as the implications of Greene's

taunt, the theory of continuous copy ("a figment of the editorial brain"), Shakespeare's revision of his plays after they were produced, and the theory of assembled texts. I think this book may be taken as standard: here is the fullest and fairest statement of our understanding of the texts of Shakespeare at this date, subject to possible qualification only in matters of detail. And it does not close the discussion: it indicates a number of questions which remain to be answered, to which we may now turn our attention.

M. A. SHAABER

University of Pennsylvania

The Complete Poems of John Donne. Edited by ROGER E. BENNETT. Chicago: Packard and Company, 1942. Pp. xxix + 306. \$.95.

Mr. Bennett's edition of Donne's poems was prepared avowedly for "those who wish to read Donne's poetry for pleasure." For this purpose, it is admirable; it is compact, well bound and printed, and obvious misprints are few. In order to free the text from all unnecessary difficulties, spelling and punctuation have been skillfully modernized. Textual apparatus has been kept at a minimum. Clearly, the editor's purpose was to render Donne's meaning as immediately apparent as possible; it speaks well for his success that even the experienced reader of Donne gains here a fresh appreciation of the vigor, adroitness, and flow of Donne's ideas.

Those who read chiefly for pleasure are likely to complain only of the omission of an adequate commentary on the poems themselves. In his introduction, Professor Bennett discusses the dating of the poems and certain general aspects of Donne's poetry; but, as he approaches the individual piece, the reader is left to struggle as best he may with Donne's intricacies of thought and his erudition, even though his grasp of an entire chain of ideas may depend upon his understanding a contemporary reference or an archaic phrase. This lack of annotation is the more regrettable because the best source of such help, Grierson's two-volume edition, is seldom readily available to the general reader. Nor would it be entirely satisfactory if it were: sometimes the essential information is not given, and, when it is, it is frequently submerged in a defense of the reading chosen or in a discussion of the sources or analogues of Donne's thought. Thus, even after this latest one, the field is still open for an edition satisfactorily annotated for the person who, though interested, is unfamiliar with the details of seventeenth-century vocabulary and learning. Yet perhaps Mr. Bennett has made the best possible compromise between his purpose and the circumstances under which the edition was published,

for the inclusion of an adequate commentary might have added materially to the volume in both size and cost.

For scholars, likewise, this edition is significant, inasmuch as the text differs from Grierson's in hundreds of readings. In part, this is due to the editor's commendable independence of judgment, and in part to the method adopted for the establishment of the text. Grierson constructed a composite text from the manuscripts and editions available to him, whereas Professor Bennett took as his basis for each poem "whatever accessible text has the fewest obvious errors" and emended it, apparently, only when emendation seemed unavoidable. Though the resulting text is doubtless very close to what some of Donne's contemporary readers accepted, one doubts that the method is so likely as Grierson's to establish the text which Donne wrote. By the very nature of the manuscript transmission of the poems, it is unlikely that any one source is wholly free of error, and Bennett's fidelity to his chosen source almost guarantees the retention of some of these early misreadings. Many of the variations from the standard text are trivial, and few make any change in the meaning of the stanza or poem as a whole. Some, however, are significant; and the validity of those few the scholar of Donne will wish to examine closely and determine for himself. In short, though this edition will not supersede Grierson's for scholarly use (a thing which was never intended), no scholar can afford to ignore it.

ROLAND B. BOTTING

The State College of Washington

Milton in the Puritan Revolution. By DON M. WOLFE. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1941. Pp. xiv + 496.

This book is not quite what its title implies. It might be called "The Social Reform Thought of Milton, Winstanley, Walwyn, Lilburne and Others." The reviewer continued to hope that the threads were going to be tied together, that the others were to be closely related to Milton in some way. His hope was vain. Mr. Wolfe has given a careful and intelligent analysis of many pamphlets, especially of those on the radical side. He will save many students the trouble of going to the Thomason tracts.

What he has said about the social philosophy of Milton seems to me good. He is somewhat disappointed that Milton, whom he venerates, was not more left-wing. But he has to admire him nevertheless as the first Englishman to speak out for a free press. Other virtues he concedes to him: "Much as Milton despised the ignorance of the masses, it can never be said of him that he did not aspire in his heart for their inhabiting that more ideal world

which he believed possible of realization." Again he says: "Milton is entitled to a place as a democratic reformer because in the course of history the liberties for which he stood have gradually become identified with those reforms demanded and achieved by an increasingly large number of voters." Milton's individualism and his sense of abstract justice "as embodied in the law of nature" appeal to Mr. Wolfe. He emphasizes Milton's conscious attempt to reason consistently from first principles and suggests that he failed less often than a cursory reading of his pamphlets would indicate. Another quotation from Wolfe must be given:

Milton the religious thinker is a striking contradiction to Milton the poet. As a poet Milton was constantly aware of the need of images, of dependence upon traditional poetic devices, of the efficacy of the objective point of view. Master of the classicist art, he thoroughly understood the magic of transporting his reader to the realm of fancy, a realm made real through touch and smell and sound. . . . Scorning tradition and hating ritual, he seems to have held in contempt all effort to create periodically amid the bleakness of daily life a world of mystic beauty and spiritual exaltation. Images he despised as idols. . . . Radical Protestant that he was, religion was to him an ethical code rather than the art of communion through fusion of sense and spirit.

There are many other good passages in this book, there is now and then discernment and even wisdom. Mr. Wolfe's best is very good. He lacks a little the deep familiarity with events and institutions that would have made his work riper. He might say that Masson had dealt with those matters but much has been done since Masson. I wish he had cut the book by a quarter or possibly a third; it is repetitious, wordy, and too crowded with adjectives. There are several misprints. The appendix with various tracts reprinted is useful.

WALLACE NOTESTEIN

Yale University

George Whetstone: Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters. By THOMAS C. IZARD. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 158. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 297. \$3.75.

The opening chapter of this welcome book ably advances our knowledge of Whetstone's life. Though Dr. Izard has failed to determine when Whetstone was born (he favors 1551), where he was educated, and who his wife was, he provides much new information of importance, and he makes it abundantly clear that the previous accounts needed thorough overhauling.

Among other things, he has successfully tackled the problem as to what parts of Whetstone's first publication, *The Rocke of Regard*

(1576), are autobiographical, and he argues that, since Whetstone's dedicatory preface to *The Honorable Reputation of a Souldier* (1585) states that he was without military experience, we must certainly regard as non-autobiographical the first-person references in the earlier work (in the first part of "The Ortchard of Repentance") to service in the Low Countries. He concludes that Whetstone began his service there in 1587 and not, as is usually stated, in 1572, and that accordingly he was not at Zutphen. He also throws light on Whetstone's death in 1587 in a duel outside Bergen-op-Zoom with, evidently, the same Captain Udall who had offered to lead Sidney's horse off the field at Zutphen, and who, ironically enough, was accorded praise by Whetstone in the latter's posthumously published elegy on Sidney's death.

But the chief contribution lies in the eight remaining chapters, which take up Whetstone's publications in turn and devote particular attention to their sources and influence. Dr. Izard discovers in *The English Myrror* (1586) an unduly neglected possible source of *Tamburlaine*; and in his thoroughgoing treatment of the much discussed relation to *Measure for Measure* of Whetstone's ten-act *Promos and Cassandra* (1578) and his prose tale of the same story in *An Heptameron of Civill Discourses* (1582) he concludes that Shakespeare was indebted to the latter as well as to the former version. The well-rounded chapter on *Promos and Cassandra* ends with calling attention to the anticipation of Jonson in the emphasis its dedicatory epistle places on the necessity for verisimilitude and fidelity. A passage in this epistle also appears to have been the source of a famous passage in Sidney's *Apology*.

The volume is well organized and, despite the presence of some naïve truisms and of occasionally infelicitous efforts to add vivacity to the discussion, well written. Dr. Izard is also to be commended for his judicious criticism of Whetstone's literary method and his sane estimate of Whetstone's achievement. At no time, I think, is he inclined to exaggerate either Whetstone's importance or ability, or, for that matter, to follow George Steevens in unduly belittling him.

The book has, however, several shortcomings. The appended bibliography of Whetstone's works is useful but unscholarly, relying as it so often does on modern reprints. But this, together with a failure to examine certain *inquisitiones post mortem* and other papers at the Public Record Office and elsewhere, can be attributed to the War. What is less easy to explain is the absence of a general bibliography and the frequently inadequate documentation of facts and inferences bordering on the major subject. It is a pity, too, that so much of the information about Gascoigne is derived from the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and Captain B. M. Ward's articles instead of from C. T. Prouty, whose long-prepared book on

Gascoigne shortly preceded this volume from the same press. Indeed, both of these coincident studies might have profited from each other.

J. A. GEE

Yale University

A Study of the Novels of John Galt. By FRANK HALLAM LYELL.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942. Pp. x + 237.
\$2.50.

Professor Lyell's critical study of John Galt, following Jennie Aberdein's recent biography, reminds us of a gifted Scottish novelist who deserves to be more widely known. Unfortunately it does little more. Professor Lyell discusses the novels chronologically as independent units, with few references to the history and technique of English fiction or to the developing themes of Scottish vernacular literature. Such a method inevitably gives the impression of scrappiness. There is a good deal of plot summary and much quoting from early critical notices, with only occasionally a sharp glance from a fresh point of view. But many of Galt's lesser known works are for the first time described at length; and perhaps it is in its inclusiveness that much of the value of this book is to be found.

It may be ungracious to quarrel with the author over the amount of attention devoted to analysis of the work (both fiction and non-fiction) of Galt's apprentice and senile years, but surely 5000 words on *The Majolo* and *The Earthquake*, without serious doubt two of the worst novels ever written, argue a curious lack of discrimination,—especially since *Glenfell*, Galt's first published Scottish novel, is dismissed in a paragraph. With the more important novels Professor Lyell usually notes the circumstances of composition, traces the narrative at length, with emphasis on Galt's "prime bits," comments on plot and character, and follows the course of the work's reputation. All this is unexceptionable, and there is no reason to wish that it ever be done again.

In his bibliographies Professor Lyell is particularly vulnerable to criticism. His list of Galt's works omits more than a score of stories and articles for periodicals, all of which were available in an earlier bibliography which he mentions by title. Further, his bibliography of early reviews and critical notices is extremely faulty. He lists, for example, only one review of *Lawrie Todd*; there were at least seven; one of *Bogle Corbet*; there were at least six; four of *The Life of Byron*; there were at least thirteen. In addition, there is no reference to the many critical notices in American periodicals. These omissions, though perhaps of no great consequence in themselves, lead one to suspect that principles

of thoroughness and accuracy have not always guided the author elsewhere.

BRADFORD A. BOOTH

*University of California
at Los Angeles*

Gray as a Literary Critic. By HERBERT W. STARR. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1941. Pp. vi + 144. Dissertation.

Most of us who have read his letters believe that Thomas Gray could have been the best literary critic of his day, perhaps not so interesting as Doctor Johnson but more often correct. But the fact remains that he was not, at least to the literary world of his time, a critic at all, and to strain the evidence to the breaking point, as Mr. Starr has been forced to do, is merely to emphasize again Gray's failure to live up to his talents.

By far the best of Gray's criticism is to be found in his letters, and this is easily accessible in the Toynbee-Whibley edition. By following the references in Whibley's excellent topical index, one can in a moment find whether Gray has anything to say on a given subject. The only other source of Gray's own critical writing is in his notebooks, especially the three-volume Commonplace Book at Pembroke College, Cambridge. In these notebooks only a few nuggets of criticism lie buried in hundreds of pages of scholarly dust. Of this little the best was first printed by T. J. Mathias in 1814 and copied, mistakes and all, by Edmund Gosse in the edition Mr. Starr uses. The few specks that were left have been published recently in Roger Martin's *Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray* and in my *Thomas Gray, Scholar*.

With such slender evidence and little likelihood of any more turning up, Mr. Starr could probably not have made a very substantial book, even if he had consulted manuscript sources. He has arranged his meager evidence carefully, and, like Mason before him, he has let Gray speak for himself, so much so that the quotations from Gray and his contemporaries will furnish convenient illustrative material for the college lecturer. The most original contribution of the book is the comparison of Gray's critical ideas with the thought of his time, from which Mr. Starr concludes (p. 131): "In no truly important aspect does he lag behind the contemporary pioneers in criticism, and—comparatively speaking—he avoids almost all of the more dangerous pitfalls into which the best of his fellows tumbled."

My quarrel, if any, is not with Mr. Starr, for he has accomplished the small task he set out to do and, in doing so, has served his apprenticeship for the doctorate. It is rather with the requirement that such dissertations be published, usually at great expense

to the author. Even that should not have prevented Mr. Starr from adding the index that is essential in any scholarly work.

W. POWELL JONES

Washington, D. C.

Survivals in Old Norwegian of Medieval English, French and German Literature, together with the Latin Versions of the Heroic Legend of Walter of Aquitaine. Translated by H. M. SMYSER and F. P. MAGOUN, Jr. Baltimore: Waverly Press, Inc., 1941. Connecticut College Monograph no. 1. Pp. xi + 163. \$1.75.

The book of Professors Magoun and Smyser is the first of the Connecticut College Monograph series. The institution is to be congratulated on having opened this series with a book that is extremely useful for the student of medieval literature as it gives him for the first time easy access to important Norwegian and Medieval Latin texts in an English translation that tries to "preserve the wording of the originals."

The selections chosen for translation from Norwegian into English are from the *Karlamagnús saga ok Kappa hans* "The Story of Landres" and "William Short Nose" (done by Prof. Smyser), from the Breton Lays "The Lay of Gurun," "The Lay of the Beach of Barfleur" and "Ricar the Old" (done by Professor Magoun), the English or French originals of which are no more extant, and from the *Thiðrek's Saga* four portions (done by Prof. Magoun) which are important for their connection with other literary documents, the "Story of the Niflungs" with the Middle High German *Nibelungenlied*, "Wayland the Smith" with the Old English *Déor* and the Eddic *Völundarkviða* and "Walter and Hildegund" with other versions of the legend of Walter of Aquitaine and "Hildebrand and Alebrand" with the *Hildebrandslied*.

In Part II Professor Magoun translates three Medieval Latin texts, two of which, the "Poem of Walter" (*Waltharii Poesis*) and "Walter the Strong, Count of Tyniec," are related in subject-matter to "Walter and Hildegund" of Part I, whereas the third text "Walter, Monk of Novalesa" (*Waltarius Monachus Novaciensis*) is of importance only insofar as "students of the legend have reckoned with it persistently."

The authors have well succeeded in providing in the introduction, in the head-notes and in the index brief, yet very valuable information about sources, research, names and sites etc.

The book is a fine tribute of Professors Magoun and Smyser to their late friend, Dr. F. Stanton Cawley.

F. MEZGER

Bryn Mawr College

BRIEF MENTION

The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes. By LOUIS C. JONES. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 259. \$2.75. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 157. This book is a well organized and carefully documented account of the subject it professes to treat. One looks in vain for the usual titillations which most people seem still to expect and often get when they read books on this aspect of eighteenth century life. The author has evidently given his varied source material genuine critical consideration; he has a style that walks forward fearlessly and a sense of humor that refuses to regard anything human as alien. He manages to present his facts, his anecdotes, and his characters with a very welcome freshness, often relating the freakishness of much that went on in these Hell-fire clubs, the horrors of their profanities that so shocked contemporaries, their obscenities that marked sometimes lack of character but often lack of good taste, to the whole picture of manners and morals of the time and leaving us with a sense of balance not often achieved in books of this kind. Some may feel that the curve of rakishness which gives the book its form, from the tradition of the Scourers and Mohocks through the grand climacteric of Medmenham to the last expiring none-too-decorous gasps of clubs that had lived long into the unsympathetic nineteenth century, is somewhat too rigidly insisted on. Riding the goat, or watching others do it, and the group worship of Venus and Bacchus are at all times fairly popular, but the Medmenham goat (or was it a baboon?) had very special markings, as had the wig that Lord Moray stole from the Beggar's Benison, and Mr. Jones has a perfect right to ask us to observe these as they become more and more clearly visible and then gradually blurred out. Students of literary history will find many familiar names here; they will perhaps be particularly interested in the account of Sterne and the Demoniacs, and in the scattered verses of the clubs, some of which remind one of the looser efforts of the earlier Scriblerus.

Duke University

W. H. IRVING

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Adams, Henry *Hitch*.—English Domestic or homiletic tragedy, 1575 to 1642. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1943. Pp. xii + 228. \$2.50.

Allen, Don Cameron, ed. — The owles almanacke. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. viii + 103. \$1.50.

Brady, Caroline.—The legends of Ermanric. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: U. of Calif. Press, 1943. Pp. xii + 341. \$3.00.

Brewer, Edward V. — The New England interest in Jean Paul Friedrich Richter. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: U. of Calif. Press, 1943. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Mod. Phil., 27, no. 1.)

Harrold, Charles Frederick.—A Newman treasury. *New York*: Longmans, 1943. Pp. xii + 405. \$3.50.

Kenyon, John S., and **Knott, Thomas A.** — A pronouncing dictionary of American English. *Springfield*: Merriam, 1944. Pp. lii + 484.

Ward, A. C. — A literary journey through wartime Britain. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1943. Pp. vi + 96. \$2.00.

Wilcox, Stewart C. — Hazlitt in the workshop: the manuscript of *The fight*. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. xiv + 94.

FRENCH

Béraud, Jean.—Initiation à l'art dramatique. *Montreal*: Variétés, 1942. 227 pp. \$1.50.

Caillois, Roger. — Le Roman policier. *Buenos Aires*: Lettres françaises, 1941. 73 pp.

Cartledge, H. A. and Axton, H. E. D. — Fr. Prose Comp. *London*: Arnold, 1943. 238 pp. 3/6.

Denoeu, Fr. and Hall, R. A. — For Colleges and the Armed Forces, Spoken French, Basic Course. *Boston*: Heath, 1943. x + 517 pp.

De Vries, Louis.—French-English Science Dictionary for students in agricultural, biological and physical sciences. *New York*: McGraw-Hill, 1943. 546 pp. \$3.50.

Georges-Michel, M. — Gens de théâtre que j'ai connus, 1900-1940. *New York*: Brentano's, 1942. 262 pp. \$2.00.

Gildea, Sister Marianna.—Expressions of Religious Thought and Feeling in the *Chansons de Geste*. Diss. *Washington*: Catholic U. Press, 1943. xviii + 297 pp.

Gille, Gaston.—Jules Vallès, 1832-85, ses révoltes, sa maîtrise, son prestige. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1941. xix + 659 pp.

— Jules Vallès, 1832-85, sources, bibliog., iconog. *Ibid.* v + 191 pp.

Havens, G. R. and Moore, O. H. — A travers les âges; intermediate Fr. Readings. *New York*: Holt, 1943. xiii + 488 + clx pp. \$2.20.

Maurois, André.—Cinq visages de l'amour. *New York*: Eds. Didier, 1942. 252 pp.

Morand, Paul.—Vie de Guy de Maupassant. *Paris* (?) : 1942 [Montreal: 1943].

Raymond, Marcel. — Le Jeu retrouvé. Preface de G. Cohen. *Montreal*: 1943. 240 pp.

Saint-John de Crèvecœur.—Qu'est-ce qu'un Américain? Ed. H. C. Rice. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1943. 53 pp. \$0.50.

Schaffer, A. — The Genres of Parnassian Poetry, a study of the Parnassian Minors. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1944. 427 pp. \$4.00. (J. H. Studies, Extra 20.)

Secrétain, Roger.—Péguy, Soldat de la liberte. *Montreal*: Valiquette, 1941. 346 pp.

Tannenbaum, S. A. — Michel Eyquem de Montaigne (a concise bibliography). *New York*: author, 1942. xii + 137 pp.

Tocqueville.—La Démocratie en Amérique. Extraits, ed. G. Chirard. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1943. 66 pp. \$0.50.

Verneuil, L. — La vie merveilleuse de Sarah Bernhardt. *New York*: Brentano's, 1942. 316 pp. \$2.00.

Viatte, Auguste. — Victor Hugo et les illuminés de son temps. *Montreal*: Eds. de l'Arbre, 1942. 284 pp. \$1.50.

SPANISH

Adams, N. B. — Heritage of Spain. *New York*: Holt, 1943. 331 pp. \$2.50.

Alemany y Bolufer, J. — Nuevo diccionario de la lengua esp. *Barcelona*: Ramón Sopena, 1940. 272 pp.

Alonso Cortés, N. — Lengua esp. *Valladolid*: Santarén, 1940. 184 pp.

Amezúa, A. G. de. — Lope de Vega en sus cartas. II. *Madrid*: Escelicer, 1940. 734 pp.

Arrom, José J. — Historia de la literatura dramática cubana. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1944. 132 pp. \$2.50.

Bécquer, G. A. — Obras completas, ed. S. y J. Alvarez Quintero. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1940. xxviii + 692 pp.

Berceo. — Milagros de Nuestra Señora, ed. G. Menéndez Pidal. *Zaragoza*: Heraldo de Aragón, 1941. 125 pp.

— [Poesía], ed. E. Nadal. *Barcelona*: Yunque, 1940. 116 pp.

Blecua, J. M. (ed.). — Poesía Romántica. *Zaragoza*: Ebro, 1940.

Boscán, Juan.—Poesías, ed. J. Campos. Valencia: Tip. Moderna, 1940. 60 pp.

Cabanyes, Manuel de.—[Poesía], ed. I. Agustí. Barcelona: Yunque, 1940. 106 pp.

Calderón.—Obras escogidas, ed. L. Astrana Marín. Madrid: Españoletas, 1940. 458 pp.

Campoamor, R. de.—Dolores. Cantares. Los pequeños poemas. Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe, 1941. 176 pp.

Casalduero, Joaquín.—Vida y Obra de Galdós. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1943. 181 + v pp.

Castro, Guillén de.—Las Mocedades del Cid, ed. E. Juliá Martínez. Zaragoza: Ebro, 1940. 135 pp.

Castro, Rosalía.—Obra poética, ed. A. Cortina. Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe, 1941. 176 pp.

Encina, Juan de la.—Elegía de Plácido y Victoriana, ed. E. Giménez Caballero. Zaragoza: Ebro, 1940. 128 pp.

Espinel, Vicente.—Vida de Marcos de Obregón, ed. S. Gili Gaya. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1940. 614 pp.

Espronceda, José de.—Poesías, ed. J. Llachorden. Barcelona: A. J. Rovira, 1940. 116 pp.

Ganivet García, Angel.—Antología, ed. L. Rosales Camacho. Madrid: Edit. Nacional, 1943. xvi + 172 pp.

García de Andoain, Florentino.—Literatura nacional y extranjera. Madrid: Edit. Bibliográfica Esp., 1943. 364 pp.

Garcilaso de la Vega.—Poesías, ed. F. de Castells. Valencia: Tip. Moderna, 1940. 60 pp.

González Ruiz.—La literatura española. Madrid: Eds. Pegaso, 1943. 296 pp.

Grismer, R. L. and Arjona, D. K.—Short Sp. Review Grammar. New York: Harper, 1943. viii + 206 pp. \$1.40.

Guevara, A. de.—Prosa escogida, ed. Martín de Riquer. Barcelona: Rovira, 1943. 334 pp.

Hill, J. M. and Harlan, M. M. (eds.).—Cuatro Comédias [Lope, Tirso, Alarcón, Calderón]. New York: Norton, 1941. viii + 699 pp. \$4.25.

Holmes, H. B. and Hernández, J. E.—Practical Sp. Grammar. New York: Am. Bk. Co., 1943. xix + 223 pp. \$1.50.

Jiménez, R. E.—Del lenguaje dominicano. Ciudad Trujillo: Montalvo, 1941. 182 pp.

León, Fray Luis de.—La perfecta casada. Barcelona: Montaner y Simón, 1942. 267 pp.

Millas Vallicrosa, J. M.—La poesía sagrada hebraico-esp. Barcelona: Escuela Prov. de Caridad, 1940. xii + 367 pp.

Niño, R.—Críticas a la Lexicología de Luis Anda Rumazo, etc. Ambato, Ecuador: Talls. Gráf. Municipales, 1941. 221 pp.

Pemán, J. M.—Poesía. Antología 1917-41. Buenos Aires: Escelicer, 1941. 284 pp.

Plath, O.—Grafismo animalista en el hablar del pueblo chileno. Santiago del Chile: La Tarde, 1941. 36 pp.

Poema del Mio Cid, transcripción moderna de L. Guarner. Pról. de D. Alonso. Valencia: Berner, 1940. 133 pp.

Prados y López, M.—Salvador Rueda. Málaga: Zambrana, 1941. 144 pp.

Quevedo.—Poesías, ed. F. Ros. Barcelona: Yunque, 1940. 102 pp.

Rodríguez Marín, Fr.—Sonetos sonetiles ajenos y propios. Madrid: Bermejo, 1941. 179 pp.

Sánchez Pérez, J. B.—Don Quijote. Ruta y cronología. Madrid: Escelicer, 1940. 81 pp.

Serra-Vilaró, J.—El rector de Vallfogona Dr. Vicente García, autor del Quijote de Avellaneda. Barcelona: Balmes, 1940. 94 pp.

Tassis, Juan de, Conde de Villamediana.—Senetos y otras poesías, ed. R. Juan. Valencia: Tip. Moderna, 1940. 60 pp.

PORtUGUESE

Almeida Oliveira, S.—Expressões do populário sertanejo. São Paulo: Civilização Brasileira, 1940. 219 pp.

Boleo Paiva, M. de.—Os nomes dos dias da semana em português. Coimbra: Coleção Univ., 1941. 68 pp.

Campos Ferreira Lima, H. de.—Garrete o Pórtico. Oporto: Empresa Industrial Gráfica, 1940. 45 pp.

GENERAL

Cheydleur, F. D.—Placement Tests in Foreign Languages at the U. of Wis. Madison: Bulletin of U. of Wis., Nov., 1943. 30 pp.

Galt, William.—Our Mother Tongue. Etymological Implications of the Social Neurosis. *The Psychoanalytical Review*, XXX (1943), 241-262.

Grand'Combe, Félix de.—The Three Years of Fighting France. London: Wells, Gardner, Darton, 1943. x + 204 pp.

Morales Lara, Julio.—En la Honda un Lucero (Poemas). Caracas: La Nación, 1943. 78 pp.

— Hulla errante, crónicas de la vida y del paisaje. Caracas: Artes Gráficas, 1942. 323 pp.

Peyre, Henri.—Problèmes français de demain. New York: Moretus Press, 1943. 48 pp.

U. of Cal. Pubs. in Linguistics, Vol. I. C. Paschall, The Semasiology of words derived from Indo-European *NEM-. C. D. Chrétien, The Quantitative Method for Determining Linguistic Relationships. A. L. Kroeber, Classification of the Yuman Langs. Berkeley: U. of Cal. Press, 1943. 40 pp.



AMERICAN LITERATURE IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

by CLARENCE GOHDES

A literary monograph on a lesser-known phase of Anglo-American relations—the wide popularity and influence of American literature among the British during the nineteenth century.

Rich in background and detail, Professor Gohdes's lively account of literature as a part of the life of the people, publishing as a business for profit, and American literature as a goodwill ambassador to England, is for all students of American and Victorian English literature, book collectors, and publishers. It is also a careful record of an important period in our relations with England which is of interest to historians and all others who regard British-American relations as worthy of study.

\$2.50

THE PSYCHIATRIC NOVELS OF OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

by Clarence P. Oberndorf

In this abridged and extensively annotated presentation of Holmes's three novels, Dr. Oberndorf draws upon his own rich clinical experience to supplement Holmes's descriptions of psychopathic conditions. These novels of the witty and urbane Holmes, the beloved poet and essayist and distinguished physician, reveal him also as an observer of psychopathic personality with an insight and understanding which anticipated many of Freud's observations.

\$3.00

ENGLISH DOMESTIC OR HOMILETIC TRAGEDY, 1575 TO 1642

by Henry Hitch Adams

A competent analysis of domestic tragedy, the vehicle used to drive home commonplace moral lessons to naive audiences, which interprets these tragedies in terms of popular religious beliefs, and draws attention to many hitherto unsolved problems.

\$2.50

THE AMERICAN WAY OF POETRY

by Henry W. Wells

An informal but discerning study of our poetic heritage. The author considers some sixteen outstanding American poets, from Revolutionary times to the present, to determine their contribution to a truly American tradition in poetry.

\$2.75

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Morningside Heights

New York, 27

SEYMOUR, CARNAHAN & HESPELT'S
Alternate Spanish Review Grammar
and Composition Book, Revised
1943 Edition

Retains the grammar and idiom study materials of the original edition and gives all new reading selections and new exercises based upon freshly chosen Spanish American topics. • Each lesson developed as a unit with exercises based on the theme of the reading text. • Varied, thought-provoking exercises employ all the most successful devices for drill in the formation of correct language habits. • English passages for translation further develop the cultural material of each unit and give the student practice in expressing new ideas. 280 pages. \$1.52.

D. C. Heath and Company

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

THE HERITAGE OF SPAIN

An Introduction to Spanish Civilization
(In English)

by NICHOLSON B. ADAMS

University of North Carolina

A comprehensive history of Spanish civilization which sparkles with zest and vitality. It treats Spanish contributions to art, music, literature, and architecture, and presents a vast store of information about Spanish customs.

Professor Adams' *joie de vivre* and keen interest in people bring to his book striking vigor and a fresh, personalized style, spiced with humor and provocative comment.

HOLT • 257 Fourth Avenue • New York, 10